O F F I C I A L P L A N R E V I E W

SUMMARY OF BRIEFS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE DISCUSSION PAPERS

JULY, 1986

(Interim Printing)

Planning Department, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

Publication #4-23

INPUT REPORT ORGANIZED BY BRIEF/PAGE/REFERENCE

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 1		**Staff:DN**
	(Charles Walker, Eastont Integrative Services)	
1	13/ 4.0.	RMOC should consider a subway system. At first (to year 2000), this would be a figure-8 in the core area only, linked to the transitway system. Later, to be extended to replace busway links
1	13/ 4.0.	The subway I propose could use robotic tunnelling to reduce initial costs and off-track technology to reduce energy costs (e.g. Japan)
BRIEF NO = 2		**Staff:NTB**
	(W.P. McKinley)	
1	8/ 4.3.	The 2-kilometer buffer proposal would greatly affect our family lands that are adjacent to Stittsville on the south. No reasons have been advanced for the specific distance or advantages
1	8/ 4.3.	Country lots adjacent to a village might be an advantage when later expansion is planned. The conditions could require siting to allow later infilling and easements for services.
1	8/ 4.3.	The 2-kilometer buffer is unfair to people who have made personal plans to develop country lots on their lands within the buffer area.
1	8/ 4.3.	The 2-kilometer buffer proposal shows how power is being centralized, rather than following the trend to de-regulation. Many voters mentioned duplication in gov't during election.
BRIEF NO = 3		**Staff:MC**
	(M. Bennett)	
1	3/ 4.1.	There is a serious shortage of parking for shoppers at intensive shopping areas (e.g. Pascals on Merivale Road and Billings Bridge).
1	13/ 4.5.	OC Transpo fares are rising faster than the cost of living (and my wages); also my "limited-stop" bus route was put onto the transitway, the fare increased for no improvement in service.
2	4/ 4.5.1	The federal government, if it insists staying in the core area, should be helping defray the costs of getting its employees to and from work.
2	13/ 4.5.	Perhaps parking/public transit nodes could be established, such as Steele and Yonge in Toronto This would alleviate need for Transitway extensions and reduce scheduling problems.
2	13/ 4.5.	Standing in a crowded bus feels like being a herd of cattle being brought to the packing house. I have heard that in Europe somewhere buses are not allowed to have 6+ standees.
BRIEF NO = 4		**Staff:MC**
	(I.S. Jaswal)	
1	3/ 4.2.	I am concerned that, despite newspaper articles about the lack of industrial lands, your discussion paper does not recognize this deficiency

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
1	3/ 4.2.	The South Gloucester Industrial Park is not shown on your maps. Because of it proximity to transportation links, it should be expanded to the east. The airport is close too.

BRIEF NO - 5 **Staff:DN**

(A. Zembal, Ministry of Transportation and)

1	13/ 5.2.	Interchanges along the Queensway East at the Tenth line should not be referred to in the official plan.

BRIEF NO - 6 **Staff:JT**

(Cherie Daly, Ministry of Energy - Ontario)

1	6/ 4.5.	The review of rate structures mentioned in 9(iii) would be by the Ontario Energy Board, not the Ministry of Energy.
1	6/ 4.5.	The district heating option should be carefully examined. Generally, it is feasible only if the fuel source is cheap and easily-available: i.e. wood, waste, or coal.
1	6/ 4.5.	The Region is to be commended for including the "energy saving community". We suggest it be made a showcase for the R-2000 technology, which started in the Ottawa area.
2	6/ 4.5.	The Region should consider setting out energy-efficiency guidelines for new housing as it now does for municipal buildings. Either the CMHC 1983 code or the R-2000 code could be used.
2	6/ 4.5.	The Region might require local mun's to pass property standards or occupancy by-laws, & have building officers trained to assist those renovating on energy-efficiency measures to include.

BRIEF NO - 7 **Staff:DN**

(Peter Quinlan)

1	13/ 5.2.	I cannot understand the proposal for a bridge at Lemieux Island. Won't it just increase the use of the car in the CBD and decrease reliance on the Transitway system?
2	13/ 5.2.	The Region should give higher priority to the Deschenes Crossing of the Ottawa River. The access roads on both sides of the river are already there. Many cottagers would use it also.

BRIEF NO - 8 **Staff:WTB**

(C. Hoffka, City of Ottawa)

1	12/ 2.3.	The Region should have a supportive rather than a lead role in heritage matters.
1	12/ 3.3.	The Region should have a supportive rather than a lead role in design matters.

BRIEF NO - 9 **Staff:JP**

(Dave Gimmer, Ottawa Duck Club Inc.)

1	11/ 5.1.	Shirley's Bay is polluted by poorly treated sewage being discharged from Watt's Creek PCC
2	11/ 5.1.	We propose that the Watts Creek Pollution Control Centre be phased out or modernized, and that the Official Plan should specify which.

PAGE #	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	11/ 5.1.	The ecology of Shirley's Bay has been seriously disturbed: Muskrat population has been reduced to a handful, water clarity is only a couple of inches in summer. We fear it will get worse.

BRIEF NO - 10 **Staff:DN**

(Ewen C.D Todd, Citizens for Safe Cycling)

1	13/ 5.0.	We, Citizens for Safe Cycling, would like to be consulted during the design work for new and expanded roadways, so that the interests of bicycle commuters could be protected.
1	13/ 5.0.	Bicycle commuting hazards to overcome: raised manhole covers, imporperly sighted storm drains, railroad tracks, gravel or loose asphalt. Also, wider curb lanes, better shoulders and markings.

BRIEF NO - 11 **Staff:DN**

(W.K. Gummer, The Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club)

1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed bridge across the Ottawa River at the Deschenes Rapids. It must be designed so as to not affect the Britannia Woods.
1	13/ 4.0.	Transitway policies are commendable in that they will contribute to a reduction in the need for roads expansion, less air pollution, less road congestion, and lower use of fuels.
1	13/ 5.0.	In order to prevent the impacts that we fear might be caused by road construction, we insist on RMOC carrying out adequate EIS's, conducting public consultation, and including us, as well.
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned about the Ottawa River Crossing at Kettle Island, which is a significant natural area
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned about the Hunt Club Road Extension, where it will pass through the Conroy Pit
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned about the Inner Ring Road route through McCarthy Woods
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned about the Walkley-Innes connection as it will pass through Greenbelt lands
1	13/ 5.2.	We are most concerned about the inclusion of the portion of Richmond Road through Stoney Swamp as part of the Terry Fox Drive/Knoxdale Route. Connect to 416 instead.

BRIEF NO - 12 **Staff:NTB**

(Liz Dowdeswell, City of Ottawa - Local Architectural)

2	12/ 2.3.	"That the existing heritage policies under '2.3 Policy matters' be replaced by the six new proposed policies on page two of discussion paper 12"
2	12/ 2.3.	That other agencies involved with the preservation of heritage resources be mentioned, specifically FHBRO and Public Works Canada.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	12/ 2.1.	Alternate wording: "Because other agencies are involved, it is proposed that Council play a strong role in heritage matters and its interests be stated as following:"
2	12/ 2.3.	"That physical elements such as the aqueduct, the cliff at Bronson Avenue, and other significant features of the landscape be included within the meaning of the term, heritage."

BRIEF NO - 13 **Staff:DN**

(W. Kauk, Glebe Community Association)

1	1/ 0.0.	The concerns expressed in our earlier brief have received consideration.
1	2/ 7.0.	There is still no evidence from the City of Ottawa that higher densities in the core is either feasable or preferable.
1	2/10.3.	There is still a problem in ensuring that the urban communities have develop the needed employment and social/commercial centres.
1	5/ 2.0.	Landsdowne Park should be designated as a regional-scale facility.
1	11/ 6.2.	There should be standards for noise abatement for residential areas along the Queensway.
1	13/ 5.2.	The adequacy and timing of the road links to the South Urban Community still need to be addressed.
1	13/ 5.2.	The Queensway Corridor study needs to be linked to the R.O.P.
1	14/ 3.3.	The planning processes of the N.C.C., the City (of Ottawa), and the Region need to be synchonized.

BRIEF NO - 14 **Staff:NTB**

(Maria K. Blicharski, Ministry of Citizenship and Culture)

1	12/ 2.3.	Policies should be added to pledge cooperation with the Min. of Citizenship and Culture to protect archaeological resources.
1	12/ 2.3.	Policies should be added to aid and encourage preservation and rescue excavation of archaeological resources.
1	12/ 2.3.	In the category of "built heritage", there seems to be no mention of archaeology, which should be included in the resources to be protected.
1	12/ 2.3.	There needs to be a policy on assessment of public works on archaeological sites and areas; the mitigation measures needed; and use of dedication measures to protects such sites.

BRIEF NO - 15 **Staff:LP**

(O. Stiraja, Rideau Valley Conservation Authority)

2	10/ 3.0.	There seems to be a lack of clarity regarding the definition of a regional storm. We propose specific wording (see brief).

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	10/ 4.1.	We support the proposed continuation of the philosophy that lands with environmental constraints should not be developed at all, when there is so much other lands available.
3	10/ 3.1.3	We propose additional wording to clarify the type of approval in order for flood plain maps to receive the various levels of status implied in discussion paper (page 8)
4	10/ 3.1.3	The Authority will continue to accept site-specific mapping as supplementary to the mapping included in the plan, since errors may have been made and measurement techniques are improving.
4	10/ 4.1.7	Flood control dykes, we agree, should be seen as measures to REDUCE the chance of flooding; rather than to make otherwise undevelopable developable.
5	10/ 4.3.	Slope instability policies need work in consultation with MNR, to overcome a lack of setback criteria in the Klugman/Chung report and to deal with the phenomenon of retrogressive failures.
5	10/ 4.5.	The second condition that would allow infilling for development is not acceptable and would set a precedent contrary to normal practice (i.e. that the adjacent area is already developed).
6	12/ 4.0.	We support the continued observation of the provision of the CORTS (Canada-Ontario Rideau, Trent,Severn) Study.

BRIEF NO = 16 **Staff:DN**

(Jeff Collver, Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates)

1	8/ 2.0.	Policies are defensive rather than achievement-oriented. They are mechanical, therefore arbitrary. Goal #7 - to enhance aesthetics - will not be achieved by the policies.
2	8/ 4.3.	Each country lot applicant would need to conform to the performance criteria and be within the areas designated. Approvals would be based on studies and designs, agreements & staging prgms.
2	8/ 4.3.	Best approach is to set aside general areas, leaving the local municipalities to set aside the specific areas for country lots, based on the application of clear criteria.
3	8/ 3.0.	The proposed numerical limit for rural development is not justified on any argument that "development could overwhelm the countryside and result in urban sprawl".
3	8/ 4.3.	Current market conditions should be considered. And deregistration should be considered if development is not commenced within, say, three years.
3	8/ 4.3.	There should be primary and secondary areas designated for country lot development, with lesser and greater responsibility to demonstrate merits of proposal.
4	8/ 4.3.	The 2-km policy reflects the defensive approach. It needs rethinking. There are other ways to pre-empt future extension of services, and without eliminating some very desirable areas.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
5	8/ 4.3.	The country lot area next to Barrhaven is a good example of development within 2kms. Also areas adjacent to urban Kanata area ideal for country lots and are too difficult to extend services.
6	8/ 4.3.	The per-municipality allocations are counter-productive. It ignores the distribution of the most suitable lands and "the race is to the swift". "Restricted" lands should be included.
7	8/ 4.3.	Our clients, Red Oak Developments and Judon Holdings Ltd., filed a country lot subdivision application last year on lots 8-10, con. I, Kanata. Regional planners responded in October.
8	8/ 4.3.	We feel this development should be permitted because it conforms to the broad regional concerns and the criteria we outlined earlier.
8	8/ 4.3.	If Urban Kanata were to be expanded, it would be onto marginal lands east of the March Highlands. We would protect the Shirley's Brook headwaters and the Carp River valley as perm. open space.

BRIEF NO - 17 **Staff:LP**

(Arnold Faintuck, Arnold Faintuck & Associates Ltd.)

1	2/ 1.0.2	Our clients, 383932 and 622350 Ontario Limited, wish their lands, Part Lot 19, Con.IV, Nepean, be included within the proposed expansion of Barrhaven, which is shown to be the case.

BRIEF NO - 18 **Staff:LP**

(Jeff Collver, Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates)

1	3/ 4.3.1	Our clients, owners of Amberway Subdivision, phase 2 (Lot 26, Con. XI, Goulbourn), wish that these lands be designated residential, rather that "extensive employment". Reasons:
2	3/ 4.3.1	The land is flanked mostly by residential uses; the natural features relate more to residential; the region has a 35 year industrial land supply; the village has plenty of piped service capacity

BRIEF NO - 19 **Staff:LP**

(J.R. Bell, W.J. Bell & Son Construction Co. Ltd.)

1	8/ 4.3.	As owner of 160 acres of marginal resource lands within 2 kms. of Stittsville that are not planned for future urban residential development I should be allowed to develop country lots.

BRIEF NO - 20 **Staff:LP**

(William Holzman, Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates)

1	8/ 4.2.2	Our client's land, S part Lot 27 Con XII, Goulborn, should be included in the Urban Policy Area for the Village of Stittsville. This would better use service capacity and 'square' village

BRIEF NO - 21 **Staff:LP**

(William Holzman, Oliver, Mangione, McCalla & Associates)

1	8/ 4.2.2	Our client's land, E 1/2 Lot 26 Con XII, Goulborn, should be included in the Urban Policy Area for the Village of Stittsville. This would better use service capacity and 'square' village

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 22		**Staff:NTB**
	(David Blair, Arnprior Branch of the Ontario)	
1	9/ 4.4.	Farmers should be allowed to sever lots in unproductive areas to sell to concentrate scarce resourses on more productive portions of the farm.
2	9/ 4.2.	Separation distance between farm livestock and poultry buildings from nearby residences borders on the ridiculous, because a many farmers would not be able to expand or replace existing bdlgs.
3	9/ 4.3.	There should not be restrictions on severances for retirement and farm-help purposes. Farmers have no retirement plans, they continue to help around the farm, and few acres are involved.
4	9/ 4.5.	The policy emphasis should not be on protecting agri. land (supluses are common anyway), but on problems such as low farm gate prices, high fuel costs, and high interest rates.
5	9/ 4.3.	Area OMAF offices should work more closely with the farmers and the Regional Land Div. Cttee. to assess individual severance applications to dtermine if advantageous to farmer and agricultr
5	9/ 4.3.	The current rules should be retained. The LDCs have demonstrated exceptional ability to identify bona fide severance requests, taking into account situations: illness, hardship, etc.
BRIEF NO = 23		**Staff:DN**
	(Ralph Harrison, Dow's Lake Residents' Association)	
1	13/ 5.2.	The connection of the Champagne Arterial to Carling causes us concern about increased traffic on roads in our neighbourhood, as cars will avoid the Carling-Bronson intersection.
1	13/ 5.2.	If Champagne Arterial extends to Carling, then it should connect to Prince of Wales Drive as well. This might remove some of the potential increase in traffic on Carling and Bronson.
BRIEF NO = 24		**Staff:DN**
	(Janet E. Bradley, Soloway, Wright, Houston, Greenberg,)	
1	2/10.1.	The Steenbakker lands should be included in the West Urban Community.
2	2/10.1.	Reasons: 1) WUC boundaries need to be expanded to achieve pop. objective, 2) services avail., 3)would widen - vs. lengthen - WUC, 4) lands not able to be used for farming.
BRIEF NO = 25		**Staff:DN**
	(Barry Lithwick, Elsett Realty Ltd.)	
1	2/10.1.	The boundaries of Stittsville should be expanded because it needs more population to utilize service and to support community amenities.
2	2/10.1.	We support the Township of Goulbourn's position that there should not be any population limit for Stittsville, except as determined by the ability of the mun. services to support growth.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 26		**Staff:DN**
	(Barry Lithwick, Lithwick Bros.)	
1	2/10.1.	Our lands bounded by Woodroffe, Fallowfield-RR, Strandherd, and Greenbank is a logical choice for future urban growth. There are a wide range of services available to be utilized.
BRIEF NO = 27		**Staff:CC**
	(Gary J. Sirois, Canterbury Community Association)	
1	2/10.1.	The Barrhaven option is well proven by the Region, especially on the basis of regional transportation access.
2	2/ 8.0.	We agree that 1) housing demand will favour single-family, 2) there is not excess roadway capacity for growth inside GB, 3) the federal lands inside GB will not be available for housin
2	4/ 4.2.	We agree with the objectives for the central area and urge the Region to initiate with the NCC and Ottawa joint preparation of a mutually-agreed upon approach to central area development
2	5/ 6.0.	We agree that the Region should control the location of regional-scale facilities and agree with recommendations 1 through 5
2	6/ 4.2.	We agree that related community facilites should be: 1) on transit routes, 2) grouped together, and 3) have safe, convenient pedestrian and bicycle access.
3	6/ 4.3.	We agree that 1)all new high-density residential development be located on streets serviced by transit, and 2)the Region coordinate development of med/high density housing at transit stations.
3	7/ 4.5.	Residential intensification may have adverse effects on some neighbourhoods. Underutilization of housing may be temporary; remedies such as rooming houses may thwart inmovement of families
3	7/ 4.4.	We agree with a strong Regional role in housing. In particular, review of local municipal plans for assisted housing to ensure distribut'n acros region based on demographic, socio-econ, factors
3	11/ 5.2.	We strongly support waste recycling as a way to reduce municipal costs, minimize environmental degradation, and conserve energy.
3	12/ 4.0.	We strongly favour creation of a linear open space system through existing and future urban areas, based largely on federal land originally purchased for a parkway system; unique to Region
4	12/ 5.0.	We support designation of the Greenbelt Reserve. It structures urban area into distinct communities, vs. sprawling suburbs. RMOC should request NCC to review all greenbelt developments
4	13/ 4.0.	We support the emphasis given to the transitway construction program, but also upgrades to the road network.
4	13/ 5.0.	We find the road construction priorization agreeable. The low priority assigned to the Alta Vista Parkway means that the corridor can become part of the open space system in meantime

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
4	14/ 3.4.	We favour the provisions for community consultation, and have enjoyed our participation during the two phases of the current review.

BRIEF NO - 28 **Staff:DN**

(Murray R Kydd, Metcalfe Realty Company Limited)

1	9/ 4.1.	We object to our lands (Lot 12, Con. IV, Kanata) being redesignated from "marginal" to "agricultural". We intend to ask for a rezoning to allow them to be use for industrial purposes.

BRIEF NO - 29 **Staff:CC**

(J. Almst D. Paskovich, Residents of Westboro Beach Area)

1	6/ 4.3.	The Region should: 1) provide a futuristic view to inspire planners and citizens, 2) do on-going evaluation of development along corridor, 3) clarification of process, various agency roles.
1	6/ 4.3.	Appendix included: U.S. Study for DOT and HUD, "The Land Use and Urban Development Impacts of B.A.R.T." (San Francisco's Bay Area Rapid Transit system), undated.
1	6/ 4.3.	We object to the lack of planning for lands along the transitway corridor; the City has one idea, the Region has another. The Region does not address housing needs or social impacts.

BRIEF NO - 30 **Staff:NTB**

(Ted Huffman, Ontario Institute of Agrologists)

15	9/ 4.5.	We agree that the RMOC should establish an advisory committee on agriculture to make recommendations on interpreting general policies on specific parcels of land.
16	9/ 4.1.	There should be TWO different agricultural designations: a) "agriculture exclusive" and b) "agriculture priority". a)=better soils, no encorachment; b)=poorer soils, buffer for a).
19	9/ 4.5.	RMOC should discourage unsightly and offensive practices such as garbage disposal, scrap collections, and vandalism. Feelings of pride and well-being in rural area to be encouraged.
19	9/ 4.5.	RMOC should undertake immediately a comprehensive study of planning mechanisms such as transfer of development rights, agricultural reserves, and land trades.
19	9/ 4.5.	All farmers should have a "right to farm", even if not in agricultural zone. They could appeal to advisory committee when nearby land use changes are proposed.
19	9/ 4.4.	RMOC should discourage non-agricultural development in village and hamlets located within an agricultural zone.
19	9/ 4.1.	RMOC should refuse rezonings in agricultural areas, once the new system is established, thus establishing an atmosphere of stability and security. Agri. lands no longer "holding" zone.
19	9/ 4.5.	RMOC should actively assist non-agricultural development to locate on poor land, including appropriate siting of hard services and promoting positive aspects of living on poor lands.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
19	9/ 4.5.	RMOC should encourage and assist agricultural support industries and processing and marketing facilities.
20	9/ 4.5.	4) provide legal mechanism to allow 2nd farm residence without severance or new mortgage on farm, 5) enact env. protection laws for farming, 6) conduct research re: transfer of dev. rights.
20	9/ 4.5.	4) cooperative with prov. government to improve land development and technological and management programs, 5) maintain adequate ditches and culverts, and 6) control erosion on publ. propty
20	9/ 4.5.	In cooperation with local municipalities: 1) provide financial assistance to farm groups to promote sound mgmt., 2) promote fairs, demonstrations, 3) hire and train agrologist,
20	9/ 4.5.	Other matters that RMOC could do to assist farming: 1) get Foodland Guidelines into the Planning Act, 2) improve economic basis of farming, 3) study long-term economics of farm'n.

BRIEF NO = 31 **Staff:DN**

(J.L. Courtney, Network Britannia)

1	1/ 1.0.	The papers require a cross-referenced guide to provide a feel for how the planners see the trade-offs handled. (Quality of life vs. maximization of development).
1	1/ 1.0.	The papers address, indirectly, future sharing of powers to plan, control, direct, etc. ALL functions within OC. How much would these usurp the present powers of elected officials?
1	1/ 1.0.	The papers lack a consolidated coordinated summary to demonstrate whether some policies contravene or contradict others, e.g. land use vs. conservation vs. transportation.
3	14/ 3.3.	There is a need for a clearer commitment to better integration of the officials/politicians meetings, and for that inter-governmental consultation to occur in an open and fair manner.
3	14/ 3.3.	In summary, the policies, in isolation for individual topics appear reasonable, but, as a whole represent a power grab from area municipalities, for employment areas, etc, but consultation poor
4	3/ 4.1.	Why are some centres included for consideration as intensive employment areas, then dismissed as not being on the transit system, which was known at the beginning? Is Lincoln Hts a special case?
4	13/ 1.3.	Problems in the west end need to be treated in a comprehensive way. Make a link between computer simulations and stated policies. What use was made of neighbourhood traffic studies?
5	11/ 3.1.	What consideration is to be given to protecting the regional water supply from contamination that might be caused by later construction activities on the bridge crossing?
5	11/ 3.1.	What policies are proposed to achieve better water quality in the Ottawa River at Lake Deschenes, since neither the sources nor the solutions ahve yet been identified?

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
5	13/ 4.2.	What is the future of the Lincoln Heights transit station in relationship to the Galleria?
5	13/ 4.2.	The Byron Transitway link has been approved in principle, right? What local impact analyses (including the Britannia area) work has been done?
5	13/ 5.2.	Council has already approved funds for study of Ottawa River crossings, but consultation is not yet complete. We would like to see terms of reference. How will residents views be sought?
5	13/ 5.2.	The allignment of the approach road for the Deschenes Crossing is shown to be up Britannia Road in Vol. 13, but in Summary, it is east of the Filtration Plant. Which is correct?
5	13/ 4.2.	On the request to extend the 1991 deadline for OC Transpo use of the Western Parkway, what quid pro quo is being proposed? Are Woodroffe North residents views being considered?
7	2/ 3.2.	Rather than using the "optimistic" growth estimates throughout, the RMOC should use "best estimate" growth assumptions which are one-half as high.
7	13/ 4.1.	The modal split guidelines for the west end have been raised by 5%.. What is the basis in fact for this policy change?

BRIEF NO - 32 **Staff:CC**

(J. Donovan, Association of Centretown Tenants)

1	4/ 4.2.3	Affordable housing is needed near the three university campuses and three hospitals in the inner area, because they cater to groups which are not usually high income earners.
1	4/ 4.2.	There is a dearth of residential uses proposed for the "pedestrian/shopping priority district". They would provide customers for downtown busi nesses at night and make streets safer.
2	6/ 4.0.	Consideration should be given to providing affordable housing near to the offices of social service providers, such as unemployment, employment, welfare.

BRIEF NO - 33 **Staff:DN**

(Robert Madill, Blackburn Community Association)

1	13/ 5.2.	We support the proposal to link Innes Road at Orleans to Walkley Road interchange on Hwy 417. This will provide relief for our community.
1	13/ 4.2.	We support the proposal to extend the transitway system to Orleans Town Centre as the number one priority.

BRIEF NO - 34 **Staff:NTB**

(Brian & Glennon)

1	9/ 4.1.	Our land (pt. Lot 20, Con. III, Goulbourn) is class 3 and 4 (as per attached documentation) and we object to it being designated "agricultural resource".

PAGE #	REFERENCE	SUMMARY

BRIEF NO - 35 **Staff:DN**

(John Blatherwick, Woodpark Community Association)

1	3/ 4.1.	We oppose Lincoln Fields being designated an intensive employment area, because it will cause more traffic on our streets, and NCC will probably not allow workers to use parkway.
1	3/ 4.1.	We oppose Carlingwood being designated an intensive employment area, because the regional road system is inadequate in its proximity and use of local roads reduce safety, house values.
2	6/ 4.3.	Medium and high density development must be kept out of WoodPark. They cause traffic problems and create a canyon effect. The region should have an infill policy, esp. along Carling Ave.
2	13/ 5.2.	Transit gets priorty at the expense of roadway improvements which are needed along Carling and Richmond roads to provide for growing volumes. Carling needs more breaks in the islands.

BRIEF NO - 36 **Staff:DN**

(E. Subissati, Hunt Club Community Organization)

1	2/10.1.	We continue to be concerned about the lack of analysis on the transportation impacts of the proposed expansion to the south.
1	13/ 5.2.	We continue to be concerned about the lack of north-south transportation links.

BRIEF NO - 37 **Staff:JP**

(Paul Lehman, Mississippi Valley)

1	11/ 5.1.	We support the intention to include detailed stormwater management policies in the official plan and requests an opportunity to provide input.

BRIEF NO - 38 **Staff:LP**

(Sandy Hay, Mississippi Valley)

1	10/ 4.1.6	Roadways that are within the 1:100 year flood plain should be floodproofed so that evacuations during a flood will not be hindered. Also, some floodproofing should be allowed for priv. dvlpmt
1	10/ 4.1.4	RMOC should include our flood risk maps in the official plan, and council should endorse our regulations. This should provide greater consistency within the Region.
2	10/ 4.2.	With respect to organic soils, we are satisfied with the reference to conserving and managing water supplies.
2	10/ 4.3.	With respect to unstable slopes, we support the regions proposals, noting that the fill line was extended to include a set back from unstable slopes and is part of the regulated areas.

BRIEF NO - 39 **Staff:LP**

(Jeff Collver, Oliver, Mangione, McCalla)

1	8/ 4.2.1	We support the extension of "principal urban area" to Stittsville, on behalf of our client (J.P. Chenier, Pt. Lot 23, Con X, Goulbourn). This will utilize existing infrastructure.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 40		**Staff:DN**
	(Amy Browell, New Edinburgh Community Association)	
1	13/ A.0.	The authors of this report (task A) undercut an important rationale given to councillors in 1984: the Planning act requires that road widen ings, not future roads, be designated.
2	13/ 5.2.	We recommend that the Region not build the Vanier Parkway Extension Bridge, at a savings of over $20M, and reduce the load on the Queensway at the same time.
2	13/ T.0.	Task T suggests that the setting of truck routes "must recognize the integrity of neighbourhoods and other special areas". Thus the Vanier Parkway should not be used by heavy trucks.
2	13/ 5.2.	Since the completion of the Vanier Parkway will not prevent the need for the Kettle Island Bridge during Tier Two, it would be best to apply the $20M savings to the Kettle Is. Bridge.
2	13/ Y.0.	Task Y shows that the Kettle Island Bridge would provide sufficient capacity across the Ottawa River screenline to make it unnecessary to extend the Vanier Parkway.
2	13/ 5.2.	The inclusion of the Vanier Parkway Extension in the 5-year capital works program every year as a way to garner extra provincial tax dollars, even though it is not needed, is unethical.
BRIEF NO = 41		**Staff:DN**
	(Jack MacKinnon, Southeast Ottawa Citizens Committee)	
1	2/ 4.0.	We agree with the comments made by the Federation of Citizens Associations on: growth assumptions, employment nodes and forecasting, regional housing policies, and transp. corridors
1	12/ 4.0.	The Alta Vista Corridor should be protected as regional open space, as fourth option to those of RMOC, NCC, and Ottawa. A recent poll showed that people in region put parks as top priority.
1	13/ 5.2.	We oppose the eventual construction of Conroy Road North (Alta Vista Parkway). It would spoil the NCC corridor for use as allotment gardens, small wildlife, and recreational facilities.
BRIEF NO = 42		**Staff:CC**
	(D. Husband, New Edinburgh Community Association)	
1	2/ 3.0.	The employment growth projections appear to be too optimistic. The federal government will cuts 6,500 person-years in NCR, plus more in defense, RCMP, and crown corps X 1.5 multiplier.
2	4/ 4.2.	We welcome establishment of a coordinated approach for central area development. Please advise us of future proposals for this part of the region.
2	7/ 4.1.	We question the expected decline in demand for rental housing, because of the demand for emergency and special needs housing in recent periods.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
3	12/ 2.3.	As a heritage area, we in New Edinburgh welcome the suggestion of an inventory of tourist routes providing attractive views that require preservation.
3	13/ 5.2.	We propose that the Inner Ring Road be given a higher priority, as a means to relieve the pressure on the Queensway. We see no justifica tion for the extension of the Vanier Parkway.
3	13/ 4.0.	We think consideration should be given to rail commuter services from such places as Carleton Place, Hawksbury, and Smith's Falls to Ottawa VIA terminal and Hurdman Station, to relieve trf

BRIEF NO - 43 **Staff:DN**

(Gregory Green, CCC #222)

1	13/ 5.2.	27 units of our condominium units are subject to noise from vehicles on Innes near Boyer. The RMOC should consider an alternative route to connect to 417, or provide berm or wall.

BRIEF NO - 44 **Staff:LP**

(Keith S. Bradley, and Others)

1	9/ 4.1.	As landowners in Notre Dames des Champs area, we disagree that our lands should be agricultural, since soils are so poor. Even market gardening operations are going out of business.
3	2/ 9.0.	Our lands in Notre Dames des Champs area should be made a part of the East Urban Community: 1) no self-supporting farming, 2) area has water and transit service, 3) next to EUC.
3	9/ 4.1.	If our lands are not to be made part of the EUC, they should be made marginal, not agricultural, to allow some practical and sensible use to be made of them, as natural rural-urban trans. zone

BRIEF NO - 45 **Staff:CC**

(Rick Robinson, Westboro Community Association)

1	2/ 2.0.	The proposals have failed to provide an integrat ed vision of how we can live in this region in ways that respect the integrity of all the dimensions of the natural environment...
1	2/ 2.0.	...and the interrelated dimensions of the social and human environment, i.e. neighbourhoods, economics, communications, transportation systems and the like.
2	2/ 9.1.	We oppose designating extra land in SUC because of poor projections and because the allocation of monies for services will jeopardize services to existing areas which now suffer neglect.
2	2/ 3.0.	We question forecasts for population - because fertility rates are dropping - and employment - because of the situation in this area.
2	2/ 9.1.	If the SUC lands are designated, it shouldn't develop until 1) the EUC and WUC reach a pop. of 75,000, 2) empl. in SUC justifies more pop. 3) when there is proof it will not increase traffic

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	10/ 5.2.	The Review should have incorporated the Waste Plan process, so that it could address all aspects of life and economic activities that relate to recycling and re-use of wastes.
2	10/ 2.0.	These policies should address two questions: how can the region 1) develop in ways that will re store and maintain a balance between human and natural, 2) recognise that env. sustains life?
3	3/ 4.1.	When the Westboro Station Residential Study is done, we want to be consulted on terms of reference and choice of staff and consultants. We should be provided suff. time and staff.
3	3/ 4.1.	An intensive employment centre should not be designated at Carling and the Queensway until a major traffic impact study is carried out on the adjacent residential areas.
3	13/ 4.2.	Before the transitway system is moved off the Western Parkway, an extensive consultation process should be conducted. This should be gauaranteed in the new official plan.
3	13/ 5.2.	Over time, we are afraid growing traffic loads will deteriorate our roadways. The official plan should include as a priority the upkeep of exisiting roadways.
3	13/ 5.2.	We support the deletion of the Kirkwood Avenue Extension, because it would cut off one part of the community for the rest. Also the roadbed does not have proper sub-surface structure.

BRIEF NO = 46 **Staff:DN**

(Jack Stirling, Campeau Corporation)

1	2/ 9.0.	We propose that the current designation for the SUC not be altered, because: 1) the planning horizion is too short (20 yrs. is min.), 2) % and land needs of low density housing is...
1	2/ 9.0.	The SUC in its current approved configuration should go ahead because the Ontario Cabinet ruled in 1979 that no further amendments were necessary. Only the time was left open.
1	2/ 9.0.	...too small, 3) physical constraints limit residential uses, 4) future land shortages can increase social and economic housing costs, and 5) expanding instructure later is more costly.
2	2/ 3.2.	Population projections are too low because: 1) assumed unemployment at 2000 is too low, 2) migration figures are assumed, rather than projected, 3) age-mix figures ignore inter-.....
2	2/ 8.0.	We (J.L. Richards for Campeau/Urbandale) find that servicing the larger South will not be expensive: about $3,200 per unit (cheapest of 3 options studied), based on 400 acres, 6 to acre.
2	2/ 3.2.	We (Clayton Research, for Campeau/Urbandale) agree with population projections but estimate that a demand for 6,200 more single-family units will occur during the period to year 2001.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	2/ 3.2.	..provincial work-trip movements, 4) only age was used to compute household formation, 5) headship rates are not substantiated and appear too low, 6) preference for single homes in...
2	2/ 3.2.	We propose that the region should plan for an average annual housing demand of 7,500 units (all economic indicators, including interest rates will remain good), 50% of them singles.
2	2/ 3.2.	...age groups 35-44 and 45-54 have been reduced below current trends and the overall preference rates have been changed without explanation by RMOC.

BRIEF NO = 47 **Staff:DN**

(E. Subissati)

1	13/ 4.0.	Transit costs are growing at an alarming rate. OC Transpo's annual budget (excluding the transitway construction, which continues to escalate) grows at about 20% per year.
1	13/ 4.0.	Transit priority is too costly. Ottawa has highest per-capita operating costs in Canada ($169.61, 21.5% higher than next highest).
3	13/ 4.0.	Public awareness of the adverse impacts is increasing. I have attached briefs of other groups that have complained about the impacts of buses, and newspaper clippings as well.

BRIEF NO = 48 **Staff:DN**

(Macklin Hancock, Project Planning Canada Limited)

1	2/10.1.	We propose that our client's lands (126 acres immed. east of Energy Saving Community, WUC) be designated principle urban area as a self-sufficient retirement community...
2	2/10.1.	...the land is largely unused, though recently farmed unsuccessfully. The proposal, Riddell Village, would have a full range of housing types and facilities.

BRIEF NO = 49 **Staff:MC**

(Andrew Sharpe, Social Planning Council of)

1	2/ 3.0.	We are concerned that there is no discussion of the impacts of the disparity of income groups in the exisiting population. We propose that the process be delayed until an income paper is done
1	2/ 3.0.	We disagree with your employment projections: 1)federal cut-backs will cause more paid for low income groups seeking employment ins service sector, 2)part-time job growth lowers qual/life.

BRIEF NO = 50 **Staff:DN**

(J. Kevin Carton, Alta Vista Drive Residents' Association)

1	13/ 5.2.	Alta Vista Parkway should be built as a high priority, in order to relieve Alta Vista Drive. It would be inexpensive to build compared to the significant human benefits it would provide.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO - 51		
	(Ewen C.D Todd, Citizen's for Safe Cycling)	**Staff:DN**
1	13/ 5.1.	...that these roads should be adapted, where feasible, for safer travel by both bicycles and other vehicles". This must include better quality surface, drainage, parking, intersect'ns
1	13/ 5.1.	We propose the following be added to O.P.: "Bicycles be recognized at a valid form of transportation for commuting and recreation on existing and projected raod systems, and...
BRIEF NO - 52		
	(Eric Darwin, Dalhousie Community Association)	**Staff:DN**
1	13/ 5.2.	We enthusiastically support the construction of the Champagne Arterial (the proposal shows that you have been listening to us). This should be put AHEAD of the Bronson-Portage link...
2	13/ 4.4.	We are glad that the transitway system passes through our neighbourhood (Lebreton Flats). We urge more residential/other acceptable uses of the Flats. Idea:innovative urban spine over it.
2	13/ 5.2.	We believe that the Champagne Arterial will make it unnecessary to improve Bronson, Booth, or Preston, and that a moratorium on improvements be established until a full study is done.
2	13/ 5.2.	...The latter is large, land-consuming, expensive, hostile to the environment, and cuts the downtown off from Lebreton Flats. A study of the Champagne Arterial impacts should be done
3	13/ 4.4.	The transitway in Lebreton Flats must be developed in such a way as to not cut off the Dalhousie residents from recreational and river front lands. Easy pedestrian access to be kept.
BRIEF NO - 53		
	(Jim Stewart, The Katimavik-Hazeldean Community)	**Staff:DN**
1	3/ 4.1.	We agree that the Kanata Town Centre be designated an intensive employment centre. However, the RMOC should be prepared to help us make it develop as intended.
2	11/ 6.2.	The medium-density housing in the Kanata Town Centre should be properly buffered from the noise and pollution of the Queensway.
2	13/ 5.2.	Kanata needs better roads: 1) We agree that Terry Fox Drive is a tier one roadway, but 2) Eagleson Road needs a major upgrading, which is not mentioned. Town centre needs access to 417.
BRIEF NO - 54		
	(Nancy Meloshe, Campeau Corporation)	**Staff:MC**
1	13/ 5.2.	We agree with the road requirements except for the Inner Ring Road. Its alignment should be adjusted to the north to buffer the residential lands from the industrial, as the NCC proposes.
1	13/ 5.2.	The Transitway link to South Keys should be advanced to a 1987 construction start.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	3/ 4.2.	We agree with the new employment centre designations; however, we object to the require ment for a market study before the South Keys Centre can proceed. We did it before for O.M.B.
2	4/ 4.5.	We are still concerned about a surface Albert Street transit mall on the transitway in the central area.
2	4/ 4.2.	We agree with the proposed joint approach to development of the central area, and recommend that a joint private/public committee be formed to address the issues raised in the paper.

BRIEF NO = 55 **Staff:DN**

(Robert Hillary, Kanata Beaverbrook Community Association)

1	2/10.1.	We are concerned about the Barrhaven expansion: 1) few details on industrial lands, 2) use of agricultural lands, 3) airport noise intrusion, 4) transitway to it should be accelerated.
1	8/ 4.2.	There should be more involvement with the rural community on the matter of allocation of rural lots and the proposed 2-km buffer around villages.
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned about the impact of future connection with 416 will have on the capability of the Queensway to carry east-west traffic.
2	2/10.1.	We are concerned that the Barrhaven expansion lack a clear town centre and that a great deal of additional services will be needed, in contrast to further development of east&west.
2	6/ 4.3.	A broader mix of housing types in Kanata is necessary to attract industries to the area.
2	6/ 4.3.	Developers should be encouraged to build a broader cross-section of residential properties in the urban communities: e.g. more apartments, rent-to-income, and seniors housing.
2	13/ 5.2.	Eagleson Road is becoming very congested, and with the development occurring now in Bridlewood and Marchwood-Lakeside, this could become chaotic by 1988.
2	13/ 5.2.	There should be a buses-only lane on the Q-way from Bayshore to Woodroffe, to encourage bus usage. The park-and-ride initiative will not be as successful until this is done.
2	13/ 5.2.	The Queensway west should be widened to three or four lanes each way out to Acres Road.
3	13/ 5.2.	Terry Fox Drive should follow the Hope Side Road Alignment, and should be a higher priority than the Inner Ring Road (parts of which are already built). This will move Bridlewood traffic east.

BRIEF NO = 56 **Staff:MC**

(Douglas Kelly, Soloway, Wright)

1	3/ 4.1.	The Elmvale Shopping Centre should be designated an intensive employment node, even though it meets the criteria in the official plan review.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 57		**Staff:MC**
	(Douglas Kelly, Soloway, Wright)	
1	3/ 4.1.	We support the designation of South Keys site for intensive employment node, but disagree that a market study should be required. This was turned down by council before; not RMOC concern.
BRIEF NO = 58		**Staff:MC**
	(Alan Cohen, Soloway, Wright)	
1	2/10.1.	Our clients lands (200 acres adjacent to east edge of EUC) should be included in EUC designation for long-term development. [Developability analysis attached; more details later]
BRIEF NO = 59		**Staff:DN**
	(M. Bacon, The Proctor and Redfern Group)	
1	2/10.1.	Our client's (M. Holitzner) lands on northwest edge of WUC should be considered for urban estate lot development, which market surveys show is in demand.
2	2/ 4.1.	We believe that RMOC has understated demand for single-family units and that boundaries of WUC should be adjusted to accommodate demand.
4	2/ 4.1.	WUC boundary in n-w area is problematic as a major road link is need (2nd line to Terry Fox Drive). Natural features and HEPC line define area. Best to use limit of watershed in area.
BRIEF NO = 60		**Staff:DN**
	(M. Bacon, The Proctor and Redfern Group)	
1	2/ 9.1.	The Region should set aside more land for residential, industrial, and commercial purposes than that set out in the paper 2, for roads, varying densities, and flexibility.
1	2/10.1.	We generally agree with the statistical justification for and support the conclusion that land should be designated in the plan for the expansion of Barrhaven.
1	2/ 9.1.	The plan should set aside enough land to have a 10-yr. supply at the time the next plan (1996) is approved (2001), i.e. for the year 2011, rather than 2006, as set out in paper 2.
1	2/ 4.1.	We believe that 1981-85 figures demonstrate a strong trend to the construction and purchase of a large % of single-family detached homes. RMOC should acknowledge this, at least in med. term.
2	2/ 9.1.	We project that 2660 hectares are needed to accommodate the demand to 2011, and since there are only 1322 hectares north of the Jock River, the 516 hectares south of it will be needed.
2	2/ 9.1.	Therefore we urge the Region to extend the area designated for the expansion of Barrhaven to include the land bounded by the Jock River (N), Barnsdale Rd (S), Rideau R (E), Mineral Lands(W)

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO - 61		**Staff:DN**
	(Manfred Holitzner, M. Holitzner Limited)	
1	2/ 9.1.	Our lands (100 acres at SW corner of Fallowfield Road and Woodroffe) are within proposed Barrhaven expansion. We propose they be designated "residential district". Most services avail.
BRIEF NO - 62		**Staff:LP**
	(Lionel Winch, Property Owners Group for Lot 1, Con. 1,)	
1	8/ 4.2.	We ask that our lands (100 acres adjacent to Stittsville in West Carleton) be given relief from the 2-km buffer, because village expansion will never be considered in this direction.
BRIEF NO - 63		**Staff:DN**
	(Joe Courtney, Federation of Citizens' Associations)	
1	2/10.4.	We are disappointed that the paper does not address the direction of Council to provide for infrastaructure to be provided incrementally dependent on actual growth during the planperiod
2	2/ 3.0.	The 2% rate of growth expected in federal jobs does not appear to be justified, and there is not sufficient alternate source for these jobs. And no plan for revenue for services if not met.
2	2/10.4.	The Outaouais is ignored in analysis of effects of new RMOC jobs on residential and job growth there.
2	2/10.4.	Staff do not seem to be willing to recognize that timing and location of services can affect employment and pop. growth, or vice-versa.
2	3/ 4.1.	We are concerned that sites for intensive employment nodes were fixed without prior consultation with area municipalities. As a result, too many sites; unorderly pressure on services.
2	3/ 4.1.	Some sites to be designated for intensive employment are being opposed by neighbourhood groups, e.g. Carlingwood.
2	7/ 4.4.	The housing paper does not provide direction as to how more affordable housing could be provided. Not enough attention is given to non-residential lands being used for housing.
2	7/ 4.0.	Planners ignore housing demand of non-nuclear households, changing tastes, and the higher costs to service ground-oriented housing, and thus over-estimate the demand for single housing
2	7/ 4.0.	If land were not as available and land prices rose, developers might opt for more medium density projects.
2	7/ 4.0.	Planners do not consider the housing demand of those who cannot afford market level rents or purchase prices. They do not look at incomes in relationship to housing demand.
2	7/ 4.3.	No projections are given for housing supply in the Outaouais.
3	2/10.1.	What are the costs and phasing for the roads for Barrhaven in the next 20 years?

PAGE #	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
3	2/10.4.	There needs to be identifiable criteria or benchmarks that should be met before RMOC proceeds to development regarding the next level of the plan.
3	2/10.4.	Staff concentrate on arriving at a particular population in a particular year. How do we get there? And what if it takes 30 years to reach the target population instead of the high rate?
3	2/10.4.	Which infrastructure elements will be built first? Will the region try to service all three urban communities at the same time, or will Barrhaven development wait for EUC/WUC performnc
3	2/10.4.	What will Regional planners do if objectives in the future are not met? For instance, how would they prevent a random dispersal of future decentralized employment?
3	13/ 5.2.	What changes are needed to be made to Schedule C and what is the time-frame for implementation? What ranking and criteria are assigned to the three Ottawa River Bridges being considered?
3	13/ 4.4.	By what means, physical and consultative, will the RMOC encourage the location of employment at transit nodes?
3	13/ 4.1.	What is the basis for raising modal splits, especially in the west end where actually splits have dropped? What evidence is there that they will eventually increase?
3	13/ 3.0.	What qualitative factors, if any, were excluded in the 'sensitivity analysis', and how would the results have differed if the excluded parts had been included?
3	13/ 5.2.	How are downtown congestion and poor quality of the road sourface related to tier 1 and tier 2 requirements?
3	13/ 5.2.	What is the distinction, in layman's language, between tier 1 and tier 2 road requirements?

BRIEF NO = 64 **Staff:CC**

(Pamela Sweet, Township of Cumberland)

1	2/10.4.	In fact, extension of infrastructure to the South should wait until infrastructure to the EUC is in place.
1	2/10.4.	Those who create employment are attracted to prospects of future growth as much as existing markets. We (Cumberland Twp.) are active providing serviced land to attract industry.
1	2/10.4.	We disagree that future population growth in Orleans should be dependant on meeting specified levels of employment. This would create uncertainty and delay needed transp improvements
2	2/10.1.	Two small boundary expansions to the EUC should be considered: 1) N. of Hwy 17 where a marina & hotel would go, and 2) the small triangle S of Innes, N of Hydro line for mobile homes, or ind.

PAGE #	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	2/10.4.	We do not propose any expansion to the EUC boundaries, but propose that it be considered when the Regional plan is next reviewed,assuming five years later. Overcome transp. problems 1st
2	2/10.4.	Barrhaven planning can go ahead, but actually servicing should wait until EUC is fully serviced. And since Ontario is delaying building of 416, Barrhaven should wait, too.
2	3/ 4.0.	We agree with the new appraoch for designating employment areas. We are concerned about 1) the large amount of extensive lands south of Walkley and 2) requiring medical bldgs in intens. areas
2	3/ 4.1.	Regional staff, rather than Regional Council should be involved with local municipalities in carrying out coordinated studies to develop employment in intensive nodes with transit stas.
3	4/ 4.5.	We agree that the central area limit for employment is 100,000, and that it is good to locate jobs at non-central nodes.
3	5/ 6.0.	An official plan amendment should not be required for a new hospital. It sould be good enough if it were located in either an intensive or extensive employment area.
3	6/ 4.4.	We are concerned about 1) the maintenance obligations that accompany the requirement for all-season walkways, and 2) does the 400-meter requirement refer to transit routes or stops?
4	7/ 3.0.	Housing objectives related to sufficient land supply seem to conflict with Part 2 limitations on the boundaries of EUC.
4	8/ 4.2.	Villages should not be limited to 320 lots, but only by actually hydrogeological limitations. Also, the best villages to expand are often also the ones surrounded by good agri. soils.
4	8/ 4.0.	The 10% limit to rural development should be dropped, and replaced by policies that simply protect resource lands and are sensitive to demand.
4	8/ 4.0.	The lot allocation system should be dropped, in favour of actually local O.P. designations, that are staged according to proven demand based on vacant lot inventories.
4	13/ 5.2.	We support early construction of the transitway to the east and the Innes-Walkley link, but the latter should be shown only conceptually, until a later design study can be conducted.
5	8/ 4.2.1	It is unclear whether a village receiving water services, but not sewer, will require an R.O.P. amendment? It should be good enough if a local O.P. amendment were required.
5	8/ 4.2.	The 2-km buffer requirement should be allowed to be varied, depending on circumstances, e.g. where an adjacent escarpment ridge acts as a logical buffer between the village and estates.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
5	9/ 4.3.	We support option 2 as the best severance policy and feel that it should be applied evenly across the region. Option 1 is too severe, and option 3 is too lax.
5	9/ 4.1.	Some of the proposed agri. designations should be deleted (see brief).
5	10/ 4.1.	We support the floodplain policy generally, but recommend the Nepean approach where the zoning by-law permits certain developments, pending cons. authority approval prior to building permt
5	10/ 4.3.	Unstable slopes should not be shown on the Regional O.P., since they are very arbitrary lines, but should be used as a warning at the local municipal level.
5	12/ 2.3.	The Regional O.P. should not contain a commitment to do promotion in the heritage field since the Planning Act does not recognize this. The Region should not be involved in this issue.
6	11/ 5.1.	The Green Creek Plant should move to secondary treatment as soon as possible.

BRIEF NO = 65 **Staff:LP**

(John Rogan, Real Estate Board of Ottawa-Carleton)

1	8/ 4.2.	The buffer areas around villages and urban areas are a problem. The owner is often a farmer who cannot easily continue farming because of the proximity of many suburbanites and exurbanites..
2	8/ 4.2.	...Such buffer areas are also under constant pressure from owners and developers to allow development. It would be best if these lands were publicly owned, since the public benefits.

BRIEF NO = 66 **Staff:NTB**

(Sharon Turner, March Rural Association)

1	9/ 4.1.	The lands to be designated agriculture are mostly owned by developers. Why protect these lands when you allow urban development on even larger tracts of agri. land?
1	9/ 4.2.	The permitted uses are too inflexible and ignore the economic factors in farming.
1	9/ 4.1.	No land should be designated 'agri. resource' in Kanata, since there is so little of that land and few than a half dozen farmers are active. And farmers will farm regardless of the zoning.
2	8/ 4.3.	We support the increased flexibility for lot sizes for country lots. Allocations are unfair to areas near urban areas. The 2-km buffer is unfair to owners of the buffer lands.
2	9/ 4.3.	We favour option 3 on farm severances, with some changes: 1) more flexibility on the length of time one has farmed, 2) allow for compassionate grounds (e.g. illness).
2	9/ 4.3.	Option 2 is suitable for use for pockets of poor land in agricultural resource areas.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 67		**Staff:NTB**
	(Richard Foley)	
1	9/ 4.3.	The farm severance policies are very restrictive and if the RMOC ever designates more agri. lands there will be more restrictions on landowners in this area.
1	9/ 4.1.	There is no point in designating my land (122 acres, of which 18 acres is class 4) 'agri', since those who own the adjacent farm lands are developers and will never farm it.
BRIEF NO = 68		**Staff:DN**
	(L. Rex Benning)	
1	13/ 5.2.	There is a need to rationalize roads. There seems to be potential duplication with two ring roads running parallel to each other.
1	13/ 5.2.	Bicycle travel should be supported on the same roadway system as cars use, by the use of special markings and paved shoulders. Separate bike paths are inadequate.
1	13/ 5.2.	Roadways should be routed so as not to disrupt residential areas or natural areas. E.g., the Britannia arterial should not be introduced in order to service the proposed Deschenes Bridge.
1	13/ 5.2.	Highway 416 should not go through Stony Swamp. Now that there is a new Ontario government, couldn't the Hwy. 416 issue be re-examined?
1	13/ 4.2.	OC Transpo is a complete disaster, although I support the idea of a transit system. So now I now use my bicycle and car. Transfering is difficult and boring (provide shopping at stas.)
3	4/ 3.0.	There are two many statistics used in describing what is wanted in the central area. Planners must not lose sight of the 'character° of shopping areas, e.g.the Market, where I shop.
3	12/ 4.0.	Areas like the experimental farm should be preserved, and might become our own version of NYC's Central Park. Don't let it be whittled away into high-rises and apartment developments.
BRIEF NO = 69		**Staff:DN**
	(Ken McCready, Tanglewood/Hillsdale Community)	
1	13/ 5.2.	The proposed road pattern in the Tanglewood area of Nepean causes us concern as we will become a 2-km island surrounded by 6-lane 'highways'. We will be cut off from Confed. H.S, & Sportsplex.
2	13/ 5.2.	Now that the Hunt Club Bridge is open, we are experiencing an increase in traffic on internal streets in Tanglewood. The proposal to use these streets as interim arterials is intolerabl
2	13/ 5.2.	In 1977, we were told by federal, provincial, regional, and township politicians that the Knoxdale/Huntclub extension would not go through on the proposed route.
2	13/ 5.2.	The Knoxdale-Hunt Club Study seemed more concerned with Manordale than Tanglewood. Are its findings still valid considering: 1) the new configuration of SUC, and 2) expanded Hydro line

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 70		**Staff:DN**
	(R. Spratt)	
1	8/ 4.0.	Passive planning is producing ugly sprawl. Let us build high - with incentives - to reduce the costs of services and transportation. Planners have an 'English Tudor' idea of rural developmnt
2	9/ 4.3.	An increase in rural population helps the farmer, eases taxes, provides casual labour, and increases urban and rural skills along with local market.
2	9/ 4.3.	The farmer would rather put up with the inconvenience of strip development to enjoy the capital gain to invest in better equipment and farm improvements.
2	14/ 3.4.	No one puts out a survey. The Region approves what is put on the table and the public has less and less influence over future planning. We get to object AFTER another proposal is put forward.
3	8/ 3.0.	RMOC should concentrate on urban sprawl and contain it; provide more areas for condominiums with open space; swap areas areas for greenbelt; improve east west roads. This will save farming
BRIEF NO = 71		**Staff:LP**
	(Robert McKay, Township of Goulbourn)	
1	2/ 9.0.	The 10% limit for rural growth is arbitrary. Also, more lands should be designated for urban growth than the 1,000 hectares in Nepean South.
1	2/10.1.	We agree with 'special status' for Stittsville and Richmond. They should be allowed to grow to 25-30,000 pop. towns and use package sewer treatment facilities. Towns:a newhousing option
2	3/ 4.3.2	The assumption that there's excessive industrial lands in Stittsville is wrong, since two of the five landowners want to develop residentially. Also, Kanata should not use this to justify pop.
3	3/ 4.3.	We will resist any attempt by the RMOC being more involved in the allocation of commercial and industrial lands in designated urban areas. This should be left to local OP review process.
3	4/ 4.0.	The 'Manhattanization' of the central are should be avoided, through coordinated planning with NCC and Ottawa and strong heritage preservation policies. Special areas should be preserved.
3	5/ 5.0.	Planners seem have not considered the possibility of a regional-scale facility locating in the rural area (e.g.,theme park). Would transit service still be a requirement?
3	6/ 4.4.	Smaller municipalities should not be required to provide maintenance to all-weather walkways until they reach a certain population, say 25,000.
4	7/ 4.6.	We think we should not agree to having roomers and boarders in all neighbourhoods (policy 16), and we would need to look at the issue of in-law suites, as they might affect Amberwood ,etc.

PAGE #	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
4	7/ 4.2.	Policy 9(a) should encourage a 5-year supply of land rather than a 2-year supply, to put a downward pressure on housing prices and add competition to the marketplace.
4	7/ 4.6.	Group home policies should be addressed in local official plans.
4	8/ 4.3.	Would policy 9 allow for country lot cluster development, where the houses would be arranged more densely, leaving large open areas without housing?
4	8/ 4.2.	Stittsville and Richmond should be towns. We agree that, once a village is on urban services, there is no need to control growth through lot allocations.
4	8/ 4.3.	Policy 9 leaves open the matter of how a 'net hectare' is determined. Can it be averaged over the township; are environmentally sensitive lands to be included; etc.?
4	8/ 4.2.2	Policy 5(iv) should refer to agricultural lands as only ONE criteria to be considered when villages are to be expanded. Otherwise some villages will be totally fozen.
4	8/ 4.2.	Policy 8 could result in requirement for a Region O.P. amendment for an infill severance, which should be required if it requires extension beyond the planning area.
4	8/ 3.0.	The 10% limit placed on rural development is an artificial constraint that makes rural land too high-priced. Retiring rural residents and young people cannot affort to live here.
6	8/ 4.5.	Mobile home policies are good. We feel the best place for these parks is as part of a village which has central services, or with self-contained systems OKed by Min. of Env.
6	8/ 4.3.	Policy 13's minimum distance requirement will be hard to interpret and will not allow for local municipalities to take into account different situations.
6	8/ 4.3.	Policy 11 often results in access to local roads at unsafe locations (e.g. near curves, intersections, bridges). Cannot access to regional roads be allowed where it would be safer?
6	8/ 4.3.	We sould support a requirement that, when more that 3 lots are created at a time, it should be done by sub-division (this is now township policy).
6	8/ 4.3.	We agree with policy 12, however we would prefer not to use site plan control to require the addition of vegetation where it is lacking. Better to add conditions with severances, subds.
7	8/ 5.0.	Rural Population allocation should be dropped. We prefer not reference to limits, but would consider a 'region-wide estate lot bank'.
7	8/ 5.0.	...3) allocation strategies differ from municipality to municipality and within the regional planning department so it is hard to tell which lands have allocated population.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
7	8/ 5.0.	Population allocation has not helped the region achieve its goals and causes us problems: 1) dormant subdivisions use up allocations, 2) applicants compete for allocation, ...
8	8/ 6.0.	It is unclear if the industrial designations in rural areas are intended to go only into serviced villages. We want to be able to have them in other locations (Westwind Ind. Park).
8	9/ 4.3.	We favour option 3 as being closest to our current policies. The RMOC should also look at the idea of a 'life estate interest' where after the retire farmer dies,the lot would rejoin farm
9	9/ 4.4.	We prefer option 1, in recognition that land use conflicts hurt farming (e.g. 'right to farm' movement).
9	10/ 4.1.7	We prefer Nepean's approach to that of policy 10. They have a two-zone system that reduces the need for spot zoning. Also development in marshy or low-lying areas should be prohibited.
9	10/ 3.0.	The objective, 'to minimize alteration of the natural environment', needs expanded rationale. We urge conservation authorities to do flood plain mapping and set out regulations as top job
10	10/ 4.2.	Richmond Marsh is being opened to development since it has neot be identified as having organic soils; we are afraid that this will cause more flooding in Richmond.
10	10/ 4.2.	There is no provision for lands which have year-round standing water, but which do not have organic soils (e.g. Richmond Marsh).
11	10/ 4.3.	We are suspicious of unstable slopes in Goulbourn, except those along the Jock River. We need more information.
11	11/ 5.3.	We should not be dumping snow into the Ottawa River, which is the source of others' drinking water, until we know the health effects of many toxic substances, including salt.
11	11/ 3.1.	The prohibition on discharging treated sewage into the Rideau River might be based on reasons that would be overcome by a small tertiary treatment plant.
11	11/ 6.0.	Development should not be permitted to encroach on the flight paths at Ottawa International Airport.
11	11/ 2.0.	The policy paper does not touch on an important area: the application of herbicides and pesticides throughout the region.
11	12/ 2.0.	We support option 2, as RMOC has resources to take a more active role. Consideration should be given to a revolving heritage fund to buy, fix-up, and then sell various properties.
11	12/ 4.0.	We support the open space policies and hope to link up our Poole Creek and Jock River areas to the regional system.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
11	12/ 3.0.	We support the policies on the visual environment and will offer suggestions of features that need cleaning up.
12	13/ 4.3.	Transitway extension to Kanata Town Centre should include provision for eventual extension to Stittsville.
12	13/ 5.2.	Stittsville needs extra access to the Queensway and Regional Road 248 needs eventual widening to four lanes.
13	13/ 5.2.	The Stittsville By-Pass should be retained in the plan. Fernbank and Eagleson Roads should be a given a higher priority. Queensway should be widened to Terry Fox Drive. Hwy. 416 soon.

BRIEF NO - 72 **Staff:DN**

(Robert Tennant, Shenkman Corporation)

0	2/10.1.	The Barrhaven expansion proposal will generate more revenue from Regional Development Charges that the Region will spend on infrastructure ($19M vs. $15M).
0	2/10.1.	The choice of a 1,000-hectare expansion to Barrhaven is supported by the review. The site has many favourable characteristics and conforms to the proposed Foodlands Preservation Policy.
1	2/ 3.0.	The RMOC official plan review contains acceptable statistics, analyses, and conclusions.
2	2/ 9.1.	The finding that 1,000 hectares are needed until year 2006 is soundly conceived and the appropriate factors have been considered. Any drop in federal jobs will be replaced by privatization.
2	2/ 9.1.	The projection that 43% of demand for housing will be for single-detached might even be too low (CMHC projects 49%). Also 5-years to process raw land is too short. More land needed
6	2/ 9.1.	The Region should recognize that five municipalities - Cumberland, Gloucester, Nepean, Kanata, and Ottawa - are accumstomed to evaluating and making decisions on growth proposals.
9	2/10.1.	The designation of Barrhaven expansion be confirmed as part of the OPR and that secondary planning and development approval process start without awaiting the completion of entire OPR.

BRIEF NO - 73 **Staff:LP**

(Barry Lithwick, Elsett Realty Ltd.)

1	2/ 4.0.	We support the proposal that Stittsville be part of the urban area, but feel that the permitted population should be larger: 1) demand for large-lot singles, 2) proximity to 417.

BRIEF NO - 74 **Staff:CC**

(Daniel J Ouimet, City of Vanier)

1	2/10.4.	We are concerned about performance standards might cause Orleans' growth to be held up so that French-speaking people would be forces to buy in areas without proper French services.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
1	2/ 9.0.	Because of the high cost of new infrastructure, the policy should officially recognize and support the role of existing mature centres to accommodate growth through infilling & redevel.
2	7/ 4.0.	We are especially supportive of policies 5, 15, and 16.
2	13/ 5.2.	We support the extension of the Vanier Parkway, because of economic and cultural benefits, but first want a noise impact study for adjacent neigbourhoods. Never make it a truck route.
3	3/ 4.2.	We support the intensive employment policies, except we are concerned about the large number of sites that are proposed to be designated. This will dilute the ability to direct dvlpment.
3	10/ 4.1.7	We support the policies of floodplain development in built-up areas, providing certain clarifications are included. We propose less onerous alternative policies for future development.

BRIEF NO = 75 **Staff:NTB**

(M.S. Millar, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources)

2	10/ 4.1.3	A statement should be included on the area in Cumberland Township that is administered by Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.
2	12/ 4.0.	We will assist in identifying prime maple sugar bushes and other prime forest lands for consideration.

BRIEF NO = 76 **Staff:CC**

(Merrill Cutts, City of Gloucester)

1	2/ 6.0.	The Region is wrong in assuming that the allocation of services will direct urban growth; the conclusion must be that the implicit assumptions were not correct.
2	2/ 4.0.	The strategy must take into account market factors: 1) market focus (builders produce what is popular at the time), 2) housing scale and preference by location, 3) locational preference
2	2/ 6.0.	It has been proven wrong that developers and home buyers will blindly follow the constraints based on the assumption that land generally will be developed with chosen housing mix and density
4	2/ 4.0.	...the 1,100-sq.ft. row units that were built for the younger families in the early '70's, are redundant for the 25-34 group who want small lot detached units. Conversion or deterioration?
4	2/ 4.0.	The baby boom will create 'over-building' of different types of housing needed by this pop. bulge at one point in their life cycle, but not needed during the next. For example,...
7	2/ 4.0.	Double the land might be needed to be added to the urban envelope than proposed because the market demand for a particular style of unit is not fulfilled by the existing housing stock.
8	2/ 9.1.	The region can't assume that all designated land will be developed in the new urban areas: 1) higher density housing looks for better location (and the blocks set aside for it will sit), ...

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
8	2/10.1.	The Region is providing, therefore, only one area for detached housing for the 1991-2006 period: Barrhaven. Some people may, however, not want to live there.
8	2/10.1.	The subdivision and sale of all major holdings for detached units in Orleans, data shows, will be completed by 1991, ten years earlier than predicted by the Region.
8	2/10.1.	If Region has only one location available for detached housing (Barrhaven), people will simply go to the rural areas for their housing, even if they sacrifice extra traveling costs and time.
8	2/ 9.1.	...and 2) smaller holdout owners will overprice their properties and they will be left out. Thus more land is needed to be designated for future growth.
9	2/10.1.	We propose that urban development be permitted 3 additional locations: 1) Notre Dames de Champs (5-10,000 pop.), 2) Bank Street/Leitrim (35,000-40,000), and 3) SE of Airport (25,000-35,000)
10	2/10.1.	Bank Street/Leitrim locations advantages: 1) easy to service, 2) excess road capacity available, 3) close to employment, 4) no transitway needed (only 40,000 pop), 5) no agri. lands
12	2/ 9.1.	SW of Airport (Gloucester) advantages: 1) river provides natural amenities for large lot dev., 2) no transitway needed (only 25,000 pop.).
13	2/ 9.1.	Barrhaven expansion faces two problems: 1) dev. next to Rideau River will clog Prince of Wales, Fisher, and Merivale roads, 2) transitway would be needed, but very expensive for 60,000 pop.
14	2/ 9.1.	Kanata will develop very slowly and cannot be counted on to absorb expected pop. growth: 1) high tech industry in slump, 2) most land set for med-high densities which are in wrong locatn
20	3/ 4.1.	There should be no specific floor space ratio, or limit to size of office buildings, or policy on joint development of transitway stations, or reference to site plans in policies
23	4/ 4.0.	There seems to be no policies here (except statements on cooperation, which should be dropped), but that is OK because the central area development is self-limiting,nothing needed
25	5/ 6.0.	Location of facilities should be based on them being EFFECTIVE, rather than equitable. Also policy 4 should be dropped, because transit service is OC Transpo and local responsiblity.
28	6/ 4.2.	Policy 2 is overstated and should not make reference to matters under municipal control, such as site plans and zoning.
28	6/ 4.3.	Policies 3,4,&5 potentially trespass on local municipal functions. They should be stated more generally or omitted.
31	7/ 4.1.	The intent of the Regional and Municipal Housing Statements are acceptable, but the reliance on historical data as housing 'targets' must be reconsidered and not tied to plan approvals.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
34	8/ 4.0.	Policies acceptable except for arbitrary lot sizes and lot allocations among municipalities. Better to have approval on a case-by-case basis.
37	9/ 4.1.	Do not designate the Notre Dames des Champs, South Bank Street, and SW Airport sites, since we propose these be designated for urban development.
39	10/ 4.0.	Policies 6,8,12,13,16,&17 can be restated as only two policies: 1) establish permitted uses in constraint areas, and 2) require local zoning amendments to permit use of these lands.
42	11/ 5.3.	These polcies have been well refined. But there should not be any reference to zoning and site plans should be removed
44	12/ 2.3.	Policy 4 should require region to 'provide such monetary and professional assistance as may be feasible'.
45	12/ 3.3.	The policy to limit visibility of houses on lots smaller than 10 hectares should not make reference to site plan approvals which are not practical.
47	13/ 2.0.	The transporation tests did not consider all the options (they left out possible development at Bank Street/Leitrim and Airport SW). So the work is useless in considering the alternatives.
52	2/ 8.0.	The regional development strategy is too limited: available data were ignored and options were not studied, costs were not itemized.

BRIEF NO = 77 **Staff:LP**

(Edward Costes)

1	2/ 9.1.	I own industrial land in Stittsville that was about to be rezoned residential in 1985 when it was discovered that the population allocations had run out. Could you help my situation?

BRIEF NO = 78 **Staff:NTB**

(Cecelia Paine, Cecelia Paine and Associates Inc.)

1	12/ 4.0.	There is a need for a regional open space system serving regional needs (separate from local and national needs). It should acquire and/or manage lands. E.g. waterfront & sensitive areas
2	12/ 3.0.	Scenic resources, both natural and cultural, attract people, industry, tourists. RMOC should identify and help manage such features as the Ottawa Train Station and Carp Hills.

BRIEF NO = 79 **Staff:LP**

(Sylvia Grant, Township of West Carleton)

1	3/ 4.0.	We agree that employment uses should locate in areas that would not entail additional mun. servicing costs. But we fear that predesignatin will discourage employers from locating here.
2	3/ 4.0.	...We recommend that the plan not designate employment areas - except regional shopping centres - but instead set policies and guidelines; then review local O.P. designations.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	7/ 4.0.	The regional role in housing is best limited to encouragement and support. The local housing statements provide a better overall picture of strengths and weaknesses in the housing supply.
3	8/ 3.0.	Objective #2 - on the safe operation of private services - should be dropped until in-depth discussions are held with Min. of the Environment and local municipalities.
3	8/ 4.2.2	Constance Bay should be recognized as a special case village, with many conversions of cottages to permanent housing on small lots occuring whic cannot be stopped, and pollution might results.
3	8/ 4.2.2	Policy 7 should be amended to allow village plans not be reviewed until the local O.P. is reviewed, but that the provisions of policy 6 applies until that review is complete.
4	8/ 4.3.	The plan should permit two different types of country lots: residential-only of 2 - 5 acres created by subdivision, and larger rural-related lots created by severance (forestry, hobby farms
4	12/ 3.3.	Policy 6 should not impose landscaping requirements on lots facing on internal roads in country lot subdivisions, as long as they are screened from the collector road.
5	8/ 4.4.	Infilling should be permitted along open stretches of roads serving older waterfront subdivisions. We will review these areas, now that Ottawa R. flood plain mapping has been done
5	8/ 5.0.	We agree that the proposed village policies should serve to control village growth. Uncontrolled growth may cause problems which will outweigh any advantages (increased taxes).
5	8/ 4.3.	The minimum separation distance between an urban area and rural residential should be provided on lands within the municipality in which the urban area is located, so avoid resentment by owners.
6	8/ 6.0.	We agree generally that non-residential uses should locate in villages; but where such a use is large-scale, they should be allowed to locate on marginal lands, rather that disrupt village.
6	9/ 4.5.	Farming needs to be promoted generally to encourage younger people to take over farms. Also, it needs to be recognized that off-farm employment is a key aspect of farm economics.
7	9/ 1.0.	Mineral policies should be addressed to recognize the effect of extraction on the land. The Region should have a stronger commitment to aid in rehabilitating sites and get good after-uses.
7	9/ 4.5.	The proposed Agricultural Advisory Committee should include a farm representative from EACH commodity group, who is actively farming and uses all available tools.And rural bank manager.
7	10/ 4.1.7	The plan should recognize the experience and expertise of the conservation authorities in regulating development in the flood plains, and allow development acceptable to them.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 80		**Staff:DN**
	(Steve Cantwell, National Real Estate Service)	
2	2/ 9.1.	There is no further development needed or desired east or west. The South Gloucester area is the most obvious in the south (Nepean could use some increase in residential)...
3	2/ 9.1.	...Advantages: 1) near airport and Rideau-Carleton Raceway (proposed CCEA site), 2) near Hollywood North studios, 3) near to road links to U.S., Toronto, Montreal.
4	2/10.1.	I propose a mixture of urban uses on 300-acre parcel between Bank and Albion in Leitrim area, including hotels, shopping centres, office and residential towers, and housing.
7	2/10.1.	Barrhaven is quite full now but could be allowed to expand gradually. There is not enough commercial closely to handle much further growth in population.
8	2/10.1.	Increase the population allocation in Stittsville in order to accommodate future commercial, industrial growth in the two immediate areas of this township.
BRIEF NO = 81		**Staff:DN**
	(Janet E. Bradley, Solway, Wright)	
1	2/10.1.	The Del Corporation lands (Lot 29, Con. XI) should be included in the West Urban Community. Because more lands are needed to achieve target pop., would round out WUC, and cannot be farmed.
BRIEF NO = 82		**Staff:*****
	(Doris O'Neill, Bell Canada)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Bell Canada) have no comments.
BRIEF NO = 83		**Staff:*****
	(Michael Wolowich, Kanata Hydro)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Kanata Hydro) have no comments.
BRIEF NO = 84		**Staff:*****
	(Donald A. Fox, Ministry of Education)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Ont. Min. of Education) have no comments.
BRIEF NO = 85		**Staff:*****
	(K.E. Brant, Transport Canada)	
1	10/ 4.1.	Our interest is limited to developments that could affect the navigability of waterways throughout the region. We enclose our guide that describes which developments need approval.
BRIEF NO = 86		**Staff:*****
	(Ruth M. Bell, Council of Women of Ottawa and Area)	
1	3/ 3.0.	The central/inner area should be developed as a residential area and gathering place for the WHOLE REGION, as major cultural, ceremonial, and commercial centre.
1	14/ 3.3.	RMOC should develop some means for cooperating with the NCC to develop a body with authority to approve selection of sites for major projects as well as building design.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
1	14/ 3.3.	There is an URGENT NEED for some means of coordination in the development of the Ottawa Region. RMOC should accept responsibility to coordinate and enforce an integrated plan.
2	3/ 4.3.	Central/Inner should encourage expanded residential component. However, it should develop as a unique area without placing restrictions on other commercial areas, as report suggests.
2	6/ 4.2.	Neighbourhood areas should be self-sustaining, with walkways and bike paths, and provide for small computer-oriented office groupings to replace routine travel to centralized units.
2	6/ 4.3.	We agree that areas around transit stations should have commercial uses, health and recreation centres, as well as high density residental But enough open space is needed as well there.
2	7/ 3.0.	We support some greater control for RMOC in order to coordinate housing development in all areas. We urge new development, especially integrated, assisted units for special needs grp
2	9/ 4.5.	We favour an agricultural advisory committee.
2	11/ 6.0.	Noise pollution should be controlled at the regional level.
2	11/ 5.2.	The new WastePlan should promote more recycling and the feasability of a solid-waste-fired energy facility.
2	12/ 4.0.	We strongly support the the suggestion that natural resources and environmental management take precedence over development.
2	12/ 4.0.	The Experimental Farm and the Greenbelt should be maintained. We also support public access to riverfront lands and linear open space system for biking and walking.
3	2/10.1.	We strongly recommend that the priority for new development be given to the southwest area of the region.
3	12/ 2.0.	We urge preservation of buildings, events, and natural elements for the appreciation of residents and other Canadians. Should have inventory of tourist routes or attractive views.
3	13/ 5.2.	The priority of improving east-west roads and transit facilities will provide only short-lived relief for congestion. Circular arterial roads would better relieve the east-west congestion.

BRIEF NO - 87 **Staff:*****

(J.C. Bartle, Ottawa Board of Education)

1	0/ 0.0.	We (Ottawa Board of Education) have no comments at this time.

INPUT REPORT ORGANIZED BY BRIEF/PAGE/REFERENCE (BRIEFS 88-115)
27 Jun, 1986

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 88		**Staff:MC**
	(Paul Skvor, Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation)	
1	5/ 4.2.	Our lands in Orleans Gardens should be allowed to be developed for a commercial area larger than 100,000 square feet, because 1) more than 1.5 M square feet of DSTM space will be...
2	5/ 4.2.	...needed by year 2001 (L. Smith study calls for 2 community-size centres in addition to town centre, and that they could be larger than traditionally, to accomodate community service).
3	5/ 4.2.	...2) the town centre site can accommodate only 250,000-350,000 square feet due to site restrictions, 3) the site is well serviced by roads and transit and could handle 600,000 sq.ft. of space
BRIEF NO = 89		**Staff:**
	(Henk M. Ploeger, Ministry of Treasury and Economics)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Ministry of Treasury and Economics) have no comments, as we do not normally comment on official plans.
BRIEF NO = 90		**Staff:JP**
	(Sharon Liboiron, The Ottawa Fish and Game)	
1	11/ 3.1.	The pollution in Lake Deschenes is serious (fish grow to only 11 inches there vs. 16 inches elsewhere). This is caused by an overloaded Watts Creek PCC. It should be closed or up-dated.
BRIEF NO = 91		**Staff:CC**
	(B.C. Holden, Public Works Canada)	
1	4/ 4.2.	The CanLands site should be noted as being owned not just by the NCC, but also by Public Works Canada (the larger portion).
2	4/ 4.1.	The proposed addition to the central area should be made larger yet, so that all of Cartier Square, as well as Place Bell Canada, Barrister House, and the Chambre of Commerce Bldg are in.
BRIEF NO = 92		**Staff:**
	(Terry Johnston, Ministry of Tourism & Recreation)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation) have no comments.
BRIEF NO = 93		**Staff:**
	(W.W. McKercher, Nepean Hydro)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Nepean Hydro) have no comments.
BRIEF NO = 94		**Staff:DN**
	(M.S. McEwen, Gloucester Hydro)	
1	2/ 9.0.	The proposal that future growth go south of the Greenbelt shows how development does not always proceed according to the plan. It is best to allow local municipalities to direct growth.
1	2/10.3.	The theory of dispersing employment growth is good, but in reality it is just a probable that people will travel to these jobs from the central area as from nearby areas.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 95		**Staff:**
	(R.J. Francoeur, Bell Canada)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Bell Canada) have no comments, but find the information in the papers valuable.
BRIEF NO = 96		**Staff:DN**
	(Ian F. R Chris Sherriff-Scott, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders')	
2	2/10.1.	The City of Ottawa suggestion that more growth be located inside the Greenbelt is technically supportable, but it has not occurred, even the city made the same point ten years ago...
2	2/10.1.	...In fact, the City of Ottawa continues to bring forward legistlation whihc makes it more and more difficult to realize the theoretical potential for in-fill and re-development.
2	2/ 9.1.	We are concerned that 1,000 hectares is not enough additional allocation for growth to the year 2006. It will mean a tighter market and therefore higher land and housing prices.
2	2/10.1.	The proposal to expand only Barrhaven may mean that the plan may create a situation where new housing is available in only one market area. The east and west should be slated for expansion
3	13/ 4.0.	It is our view that too much attention has been directed to the transitway system while at the same time the road system become more and more deficient.
3	13/ 4.2.	The transitway links to the east and west town centres is justified, but the southwest link will not provide any immediate relief.
4	13/ 5.2.	We support the immediate construction of the Innes/Hunt Club/Knoxdale/Terry Fox link; also the completion of the Vanier Parkway and the Bronson/Portage connection.
4	13/ 5.2.	Because we, as builders, contribute substantially to the capital costs of infrastructure, we should be consulted in determining how these funds are spent, especially for transportation.
5	3/ 4.3.	Despite how desireable it is to locate employment in dispersed noded, most new jobs - which are white-collar - will locate in the central area. So don't tie pop. growth to employment.
6	3/ 4.3.	The employment nodes proposals shows that planners have lost touch with reality and are trying to force growth negatively, and also trying to get too involved in local details.
BRIEF NO = 97		**Staff:DN**
	(R. LeBreton, Ottawa-Carleton Regional Housing)	
1	7/ 4.5.	We see the ever-growing need for a central registry for assisted housing; thus, we will be watching the Region's new accessible housing registry to see how well it works.
1	7/ 4.6.	We support the proposal to provide for group homes, which reflect the trend towards deinstitutionalization.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
1	7/ 4.5.	We agree that current housing stock is under-utilized and support programs or rezoning that will take better advantage of this most valuable source of shelter.

BRIEF NO = 98 **Staff:CC**

(John K. Murphy)

1	14/ 3.3.	I suggest an alternative process for developing the regional plan: 1) get the NCC, Regional, and federal (i.e. Neilson task force implementers) planner together at a workshop that would...
1	14/ 3.3.	...work like a first ministers' conference. (It is ironic that each consults with citizens but not enough with each other). This will produce an official plan that will last a long time
3	3/ 4.1.	Why include residential uses in the intensive areas? This will only limit the amount of office and commercial space that can be built.
3	3/ 4.1.	The commercial area on the 10th Line in Cumberland should be specifically mentioned on a map or a reference should be made to the local zoning map.
3	3/ 3.0.	The requirement for a market study is good, and should include a requirement for a public hearing.
3	4/ 3.0.	The reference to increasing residential uses in the central area should be dropped. Such a proposal is not possible and would hurt the view of Parliament Hill.
3	4/ 4.1.	The central area should be expanded to include the lands on the river/canal side of Sussex Drive, since the uses along here are more similar to the parliament style and national use.
3	4/ 4.5.1	The transitway link along Albert Street should not be built until after the completion of the link to Orleans. The need for it will drop as employment shifts to non-central locations.
3	5/ 6.0.	Point 2 is unnecessary and could cause some local municipal problems. Point 3 provides enough protection of regional and local interests.
4	6/ 4.2.	Point 2ii should not include reference to "safe" bicycle access, since this could cause call kinds of legal problems. Who will pay for their on-going maintenance?
4	6/ 4.3.	The NCC should be included in the second full paragraph on page 10, in addition to area municipalities requesting help in the preparation of plans for areas with good transit access.
4	7/ 4.6.	If by "reasonable standard" (page 10), Cumberland's new group home by-law is excluded, the proposal should be changed.
4	8/ 2.0.	Point 3 refers to a transportation system for rural areas. This might be interpreted as meaning that the Region will provide OC Transpo to new rural developments.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
4	9/ 4.3.	Option 2 appears to be the best administratively as long at it is applied across all municipalities. Under the Charter of Rights, is the definition of a farmer and 20-yr restriction valid?
4	11/ 5.1.	Couldn't the doubling up of sewer lines be eliminated by installing one large pipe and saving on maintenance? Also, the Green Creek expansion should reduce smell to neighbours.
5	12/ 1.0.	Since the money for the goal is not available, this paper should be deleted from the review. Also the NCC is active in this area and could duplicate the regional work.
5	13/ 4.2.	The extension of the transitway system to Orleans must be started and completed as soon as possible. Any environmental hearing for this should be started now.
5	13/ 5.2.	The Industrial/Nicholas connection should be moved to Tier One level. The current widening of Industrial completes a large percentage of the overall work.

BRIEF NO = 99 **Staff:JP**

(S.E. Livingston, Transport Canada)

1	11/ 6.1.	We (Transport Canada) are working closely with the Ontario Ministries of Environment and Municipal Affairs to determine a new comprehensive noise policy. This will greatly affect policy.

BRIEF NO = 100 **Staff:CC**

(J.R. Cyr, City of Ottawa)

1	2/ 9.1.	The strategy should incorporate a "growth management strategy" which provides flexibility in the extension of servicing to new areas, based on actual need and the issue of lead time.
2	2/ 9.1.	The regional council should initiate discussions with the federtal government concerning the availability of federal lands for residential uses.
2	2/ 9.1.	The reference to the minimum requirement of 1,000 hectares in the discussion paper be deleted.
2	3/ 4.1.	The designation of intensive employment area for Carlingwood/Fairlawn be deleted and the appropriate designation set after the assessment refered to above.
2	3/ 4.1.	The regional plan should provide only the intent and concept of the intensive employment areas and designate their general location, while leaving boundaries, intensity, mix, etc. to muns
2	3/ 4.1.	The Region should assess the empl. potential for Pinecrest, Tunney's Pasture, Confederation, Carling/Queensway, Billings Bridge, and St. Laurent/Cyrville, before draft plan is done.
3	3/ 4.2.	Policy 12 should be amended to allow for certain non-industrial uses in extensive employment areas. The designations should be conceptual, rather than rigid and specific.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
3	3/ 4.1.	Policy 9 should be amended to require medical buildings in excess of 4,600 square meters and general office buildings in excess of 23,000 sq.m. to locate in intensive employment areas.
3	3/ 4.1.	Policy 5, that requires community shopping centres to be located in intensive employment areas, be deleted.
3	3/ 4.1.	Policy 10 should be amended so that area municipalities will be requested to do land use plans around transit stations, rather than having them be joint Regional/local studies.
4	3/ 4.1.	Policy 7, requiring a market study before expansion of a regional shopping centre, be deleted, and replaced by upper size limits set after region-wide market survey every 5 years.
4	3/ 4.1.	Policy 3, requiring a market study prior to expansion of community shopping centres, be deleted.
4	3/ 4.1.	The definition of regional shopping centres be amended to establish a maximum gross leasable floor space.
4	5/ 6.0.	Regional-scale facilities should not be designated in the regional plan, but will set out locational criteria to be taken into consideration for new such facilities.
4	6/ 4.3.	Policies 4 and 5 should include clearer definitions of medium and high density residential development.
5	6/ 4.2.	Policies 2iv, 3i, and 3ii should be modified to reflect that medium and high residential developments and community facilities be located in locations adequately served by public transit.
5	6/ 4.4.	Policy 4 be amended to require the local municipality to do land use plans for areas adjacent to transit stations, with input from the Region, the landowners, the public,and affected agencies
5	6/ 4.0.	The plan should have a policy to encourage home occupation throughout area municipalities, subject to clearer definitions, adjacent impacts, and proportion of dwelling unit to be so used.
5	7/ 3.0.	The Region should recongize a regional goal and objective in long-range housing affordability, and that the Region will provide direction to area mun's; will support fed. and prov. efforts.
5	7/ 4.5.	The policies need to recognize that local municipalities can have a dual role: not just delivery of social housing; but responsibility for research, lobbying, & policy development as well
6	7/ 4.0.	The plan should explicitly recognize the importance residential intensification, and provide stronger objectives and policies to promote and encourage it within existing zoning.
6	7/ 4.4.	The words, "for which there are now no programmes", should be deleted from policy 13.
6	7/ 4.6.	We support policy 17 on group homes.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
6	10/ 4.1.7	Policies 6, 7, & 8 should be amended to reflect that, in areas where conservation authorities have regulations, certain development may be permitted, if c.a. requirements are satisfied.
6	10/ 4.1.7	Policy 8 should be replaced by a policy that, notwithstanding the above, construction in flood plain will be permitted if 1/surrounding area is developed, 2/residents are outside 1:100...
6	10/ 4.1.7	...flood or are defined as area of reduced risk, 3/the development will not significantly affect hyrology/hydrolics of flood plain, or 4/the development is permitted in official plan.
7	10/ 4.1.7	The local official plans should be required to make reference to the environmental constraint policies and designations in the regional plan.
7	10/ 4.3.	An alternative policy for unstable slopes should be considered in urban areas where they are in the area under the jurisdiction of the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority.
7	12/ 3.0.	The Region should assume a low-key role in visual environment (option 1) and that the plan incorporates policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7 found in the Region's discussion paper on it.
7	12/ 2.0.	The Region should assume a low-key role in heritage (option 1) and that the plan incorporates, in addition to policies 1 and 2, policies 3, 4, 5, & 6 as found in discussion paper 12.
7	14/ 3.4.	The Region should develop a public participation policy, in consultation with the public, including a reference to the Planning Act, and be used on all activities/actions as they impact public.
9	13/ 6.0.	Policy 6 should be deleted.
9	13/ 6.0.	...Road Network: Queensway Collector/Distributor System, Kirkwood Extension, Lyon & Metcalfe(from Q-way to Gloucester), Prince of Wales Dr. (Carling to Hwy 16), Somerset (Bronson to Elgin),...
9	13/ 6.0.	We support policy 7, except that Champagne Arterial, Inner Ring Road, & new bridge outside central area become Tier One priority, and that several roads be deleted from the Regional...
9	13/ 6.0.	...and Parkdale, Preston, Lenester, and Fairlawn Streets, and the Industrial/Nicholas Connector.
9	13/ 6.0.	Policy 5iii should not include a reference to extension of the transitway to Gloucester south of the greenbelt.
10	13/ 6.0.	We are concerned that the Alta Vista Parkway is not identified as a Tier One or Tier Two facility. The need for this road should be re-examinded before it be considered for deletion.
10	13/ 6.0.	The Vanier Parkway should not be extended north to the Ottawa River, because of community concerns.
10	13/ 6.0.	The Region immediately consider an amendment to the existing plan to provide for no future widenings for Main Street, St. Patrick St. (King Edward to Sussex), and King Edward (Qway/Rideau)

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
10	13/ 6.0.	The plan should recognize the importance of walking and cycling by providing policies that promote and encourage these; and that the plan recognize Ottawa's Central Area Pedestrian Study
10	13/ 6.0.	The Woodroffe-Carling intersections should be studied jointly with the City so that they can be combined into one intersection and sections of Lenester and Fairlawn avenues can be deleted.
10	13/ 6.0.	We support the twinning of the Airport Parkway and the construction of full interchanges at Hunt Club Road and Walkley Road. Region should continue with the NCC to achieve these.
10	13/ 6.0.	The Region and Ottawa should jointly examine the feasibility of opening the Rideau Bus Mall to mixed traffic.
10	13/ 6.0.	Central Area Transitway should be designed taking into consideration Ottawa's concerns about access to abutting properties and the integration of pedestrians' needs.
10	13/ 6.0.	The pedestrian/bicycling bridge across the Rideau Canal at Sommerset Street is supported. If funding does not come through from the Province, Ottawa will assist to find alternative.
10	13/ 6.0.	The plan should provide a roadway classification system which contains environmental guidelines for each roadway classification.
10	13/ 6.0.	The plan should recongize Ottawa's parking policies for the central area.

BRIEF NO = 101 **Staff:CC**

(A.J. Schouten, National Capital Commission)

1	14/ 3.3.	We would like to be involved in the discussion of the proposed configuration of development of the South Urban Community, re potentialimpacts: Jock and Rideau Riverfronts, agri. lands, Transp
2	3/ 4.1.	The low rate of federal employment growth and the extend of federal holding inside the GB mean that the federal government is unlikely to locate employment in the new urban communities.
2	4/ 4.2.	We agree with the need for a joint approach (as you know discussions have already taken place). The links with the central area of Hull and the ceremonial routes should also be part of study.
2	12/ 5.0.	We welcome your recognition of the importance of the Greenbelt, but you should take into account our proposals in the Grennbelt Master Plan, the initial proposals paper & present consultation.
2	13/ 5.2.	We request the deletion of Eastern Parkway from the plan and suggest looking for an alternative solution to the Knoxdale/Hunt Club extention through Stoney Swamp based on Hwy 416,...
2	13/ 5.2.	...an extension to the transitway system, increasing the capacity of an additional route north of Bells Corners. We need to work on proposeals for WUC and ultimately, the SUC.
3	9/ 3.0.	We urge you to take all appropriate measures to protect signicant areas of productive farmland.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
3	11/ 2.0.	Your classifications of natural environment areas and Waterfront Open Space could be usefully applied throughout the Region and not just to the inner urban area and the Greenbelt.
3	12/ 3.0.	Your proposal to prepare an inventory of entry routes and scenic routes which should be protected, and to highlight areas where remedial actions are desirable,is of considerableinterest
3	12/ 5.0.	Consideration must be given to innovative ways of assuring that the urban communities remain physically separated from one another and do not in time engult the Greenbelt.
3	12/ 4.0.	We support the need to protect existing waterfront open space and obtain additional publicly-owned or protected waterfront lands, accessible to the public. Joint planning is called for.
3	12/ 5.0.	We are very interested in the proposal to use parts of the GB for linear urban parks as links to the urban communities. But the rural character must be maintained.
5	13/ 5.2.	We agree in principle with the Hunt Club Road, but not with the connection to Hwy 417, as presently proposed.
5	13/ 5.2.	We will not comment on new bridge crossings for the Ottawa River until the Interprovincial Bridge Study is completed.
5	13/ 5.2.	We recongize the long-term requirement for the Vanier Parkway extension as an interprovincial link.
5	13/ 5.2.	We are willing to consider plans for an Innes-Walkley connection, subject to satisfying NCC interests in preservation of the Mer Bleue and agricultural preservation.
5	13/ 5.2.	We recognize the long-term requirement for the Alta Vista Parkway and Inner Ring Road.

BRIEF NO = 102 **Staff:DN**

(Gordon MacMichael, Carlington Home Owners Association)

1	2/10.1.	If the SUC expansion were to be decided upon, we favour an early transitway link to avoid the disruption of increasing the capacity of existing north/south transp. corridors, eg Fisher.
1	2/10.1.	We strongly disagree with the City of Ottawa position that Prince of Wales Drive not be designated 'major' and the Region should focus on Fisher Avenue as a link to the SUC....
1	2/10.1.	...Prince of Wales Drive is the road-of-choice for more cars today, and it is the logigal approach road for the Champagne Arterial, which Ottawa supports. If Fisher is widened (even...
1	2/10.1.	... if on a new right-of-way slightly to the east) would cause impacts on adjact housing and cut residents off from the Experimental farm, a valuable recreation/aesthetic feature of area.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
1	2/10.1.	We remain unconvinced that further development of the SUC lands in a requirement at this time, when one considers the infrastructure costs and the great potential for infilling in the GB.
2	2/10.1.	Fisher, as a major road, is inconsistent with the status of Holland and Parkdale avenues as minor roads, Island Park as scenic route and Ottawa's proposal to close Qway/Parkdale link.
2	7/ 4.4.	If the Department of Communications lands at Clyde and Maitland are developed, we prefer it being used for high quality housing, noting the undue proportion of assisted housing in area.
2	13/ 5.2.	We support more designated bicycle lanes on City and Regional streets and thorough designation of these designations. Cycling saves energy and promotes health. It is worth any costs.
2	13/ 4.1.	We agree Ottawa's position that the plan should recognize walking and cycling and to adopt policies that enhance these modes. Employers should also be encouraged to provide change/shower room
3	7/ 4.4.	Because of high concentration of assisted-housing in our neighbourhood, we urge the Region to vigorously promote better integration of such housing to avoid ghettoization of neighbourhoods
3	13/ 5.2.	We propose alteration of the Island Park/Qway interchange to allow cars to head south onto Merivale. This will improve access to our community.

BRIEF NO = 103 **Staff:NTB**

(Georgina Heggart, Township of Rideau)

1	2/10.1.	We support establishment of the Jock River as the south boundary for the South Urban Community (and a similar boundary on the Gloucester side) so that Manotick will not be adversely affected.
1	8/ 4.2.1	The policies for extension of services to villages should be calrified with regard to Manotick.
1	8/ 4.2.	The policy that villages should not locate on agricultural lands would mean that North Gower would not be able to expand at all. The policy should be more flexible.
2	8/ 4.3.	We are opposed to a regional quota system for country lot development. Locally administered development criteria to distinguish between mediocre and desireable development are better.
2	10/ 4.1.7	We strongly endorse policy 8, in view of the township's recent experience with river corridor rezoning.

BRIEF NO = 104 **Staff:MC**

(F. Keith McGruer, Ministry of Industry, Trade and)

1	3/ 4.2.	In general, we try to encourage cities and towns to provide for industrial facilities and infra-structures which attract industries to the area, and of course the quality of life that is vital.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 105		**Staff:LP**
	(W.C. Stevens, Ministry of the Environment)	
1	8/ 4.3.	We concur that more emphasis is needed on the preparation of terrain analysis and hyrogeological studies early in the considertion of country lot development.
1	8/ 4.3.	We are experiencing pressure to accept country lot developments were natural ground water quality does not meet the Ontario Drinking Water Objectives. Central services may later be needed
1	8/ 4.3.	We are concerned about the density of country lot development.
BRIEF NO = 106		**Staff:DN**
	(Allan R. Gregory)	
1	3/ 4.1.	By making the owner of a shopping centre responsible for doing a market study to justify expansion, the objectivity and impartiality of the study could be jeopardized (e.g. Carlingwood).
1	3/ 4.1.	Traffic impact studies for shopping centre expansion are not required to make reference to previous studies, some of which were done by the municipalities.
1	3/ 4.1.	The region should commission market and impact studies itself to be done by independent consultants and charged back to the owner-applicant The terms of reference must be clear and public.
BRIEF NO = 107		**Staff:DN**
	(K.G. Current, Transport Canada)	
1	13/ 5.2.	We support the widening of Hunt Club Road to four lanes and its connection to 416 and 417. But, further widening to 6 lanes would encroach on our lands. Please consult with us.
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned that no additional north-south road in the vicinity of the airport is planned. This should be discussed with NCC and Region.
1	13/ 5.2.	We are concerned that the Outer Ring Road is not being planned for. When we built second runway for airport, Leitrim Road will need to be closed and this will call for an alternative route.
2	2/10.5.	For development south and south-east of the airport, figure 1 shows the conceptual limit, but there is no reference to impacts in the report.
2	13/ 4.3.	The route for a future transitway link to the airport should be identified, even if it is not built for some time. OC Transpo is keen on such an eventual link.
BRIEF NO = 108		**Staff:CC**
	(Tom Smart, Ministry of Municipal Affairs)	
1	14/ 3.2.	We are not sure of the status of 'development plans' that would be done to coordinate development. The local and regional plans should contain the policy provisions of the...
1	14/ 3.2.	...councils and therefore be subject to the legislative requirements of the Planning Act rgarding review and adoption.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
2	7/ 4.6.	The proposal only encourages local municipalities to permit group homes. The plan should have a statement which is supportive of them.

BRIEF NO = 109 **Staff:CC**

(J.-P. Beaulne, Ottawa-Carleton Regional District)

1	5/ 6.0.	We support option two, which addresses the need to carefully site each new facility with regard to population concentrations, area demography, transp. services, & land use compatibility.

BRIEF NO = 110 **Staff:CC**

(Pierre L Bourgault, University of Ottawa)

1	5/ 6.0.	We are requesting a reduction in parking requirements for future development at Ottawa University on the grounds that the adjacent transitway reduce automobile useage.
2	13/ 5.2.	We are seeking to improve the quality of King Edward Avenue adjacent to Ottawa University, as well as lighting and sidewalk standards.

BRIEF NO = 111 **Staff:**

(R.P. Larkin, Carleton Roman Catholic School Board)

1	0/ 0.0.	We (Carleton Roman Catholic School Board) have no comments at this time.

BRIEF NO = 112 **Staff:CC**

(G.J. Matthieu, Public Works Canada)

1	2/ 3.0.	Federal growth, according to Treasury Board, will decline by 6% (15,000 jobs) over next 5 years. Even if most jobs are lost outside NCR, the prospects here will be no growth or decline.
2	12/ 2.0.	We (Public Works Canada) protect federal heritage buildings through our Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO) and encourage the efforts of others.

BRIEF NO = 113 **Staff:DN**

(J.L. Ferguson, Ontario Hydro)

1	13/ 1.2.	This paper should address the provision of utilities (as was done in the current official plan). We suggest adding the following policy: "The development of electric power facilities...
1	13/ 1.2.	...shall occur in an orderly manner to facilitate the efficient and reliable provision of adequate electric power. As such, it is the policy of this Plan that electric power...
1	13/ 1.2.	...facilities are permitted in all land use designations without a Plan amendment providing that the planning of all such facilities is carried out with having regard to the other...
1	13/ 1.2.	...policies of this Plan. Furthermore, Ontario Hydro shall consult with the municipality on the location of any new electric power facilities."

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 114		**Staff:NTB**
	(J.W.A. Bonser, Parks Canada - Ontario Region)	
1	12/ 4.2.	We strongly support the objectives for regional open space, but insist that there must be a balance between preserving areas in their natural undeveloped state and provide public access.
1	12/ 2.3.	We support the intent of the proposed heritage policies and will continue to keep Regional Council informed of our heritage preservation and interpretation activities.
2	11/ 3.1.	We support the proposed water resource policies, especially the measures for the management of stormwater runoff into the Rideau Canal. We will take an active role in review devel. plans.
BRIEF NO = 115		**Staff:DN**
	(Dave Krajaefski, City of Kanata)	
4	2/10.4.	Expenditures on infrastructure to the enlarged Barrhaven should not be made until the basic infrastructure needs of the EUC and WUC are met. (Green Creek expansion, transit into town....
4	2/10.4.	...centres, Qway widenings, and extensions to Terry Fox Drive and Hunt Club Road).
4	2/10.1.	The Region should plan on a population of 125,000 for urban Kanata to allow for any desirable proposals to extend the WUC, and for the servicing needs of Stittsville and Richmond.
5	8/ 4.2.	We reject policy proposal 17 and recommend it be replaced with, "the amount of growth occurring in the rural area should be monitored to ensure that the goals of this plan for urban...
5	8/ 4.2.	...development and planned expenditures to accommodate urban growth are not jeopardized by it."
5	8/ 5.0.	Policies for village growth and country lot development should be sufficient (without use of allocations) to limit rural growth and avoid haphazard development of resource depletion.
6	8/ 4.2.	The plan should not reflect an preference for village growth over country lot development, since no areas are too far from urban areas with the necessary community facilities.
7	8/ 4.2.2	Since we may want to later designate a new village in the Greenbriar/Harwood Plains area, the Regional Plan should have a policy to allow the addition of villages to Schedule A.
7	8/ 4.3.	Policy 10 should be amended to allow wider use of severances for country lots. Plans of subdivision are expensive and often result in more lots being created than originally intended.
7	8/ 4.3.	Policy 9 should be amended to include a reference to 'marginal resource (restricted)' lands as areas for country lot development.
7	8/ 4.3.	Policy 12 should be amended to provide for approval of lots without required tree or vegetation covers, if such is planted as a condition of the lot creation.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
8	8/ 4.3.	Policy 13 (both options)should be replaced by: "Where country lot subdivisions are proposed on lands immediately adjacent to a village or an urban area, they shall be evaluated to...
8	8/ 4.3.	...determine if they should be incorporated into the village in question relative to that village's existing size and acapacity to absorb more development on private services...
8	8/ 4.3.	..or whether urban developmentis planned to occur in the direction of the proposed development". This way, the Region will still be in control.
8	9/ 4.1.	The agricultural resource lands on the west side of Terry Fox Drive that are being used for urban purposes (e.g. Walter Baker Park) should be redesignated part of the WUC.
8	9/ 4.1.	Kanata will be reviewing its official plan in 1987 and will probably ask that much of the agri lands in lots 9-15, conc. III-V be redesingated on the grounds they have become too fragmented.

INPUT REPORT ORGANIZED BY BRIEF/PAGE/REFERENCE
28 Jul, 1986

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
BRIEF NO = 116		**Staff:**
	(R.S. Binnie, Transport Canada)	
1	0/ 0.0.	We (Transport Canada) have no comments further to what K.G. Current, General Manager, Ottawa International Airport, has expressed in his letter of 10 June.
BRIEF NO = 117		**Staff:DN**
	(Irena Bruzas, Civic Hospital Area)	
1	3/ 4.1.	We agree with the City of Ottawa position that an FSI of less than 1.0 might be appropriate for intensive employment nodes where other factors warrant (transit access, parking,...
1	3/ 4.1.	...traffic, access, and compatibility with adjacent residential uses) espcially in view of expansion plans for the Civic Hospital.
1	13/ 5.2.	We strongly urge the early construction of the proposed champagne Arterial.
1	13/ 5.2.	We support the City of Ottawa's position that Parkdale Avenue should be downgraded to a local street and deleted from the Regional Road System.
2	13/ 5.2.	We support the Carlington Homeowners Association position that Fisher Avenue should not be widened, since there are identified north/south alternatives, esp. after Champaign Arterial.
2	13/ 5.2.	We support the Carlington Homeowners Association position that the Queensway exit to Island Park north should be disconnected, and instead connected to Merivale Road south.
BRIEF NO = 118		**Staff:DN**
	(Bernard Boudriau, Commission de Transport de la)	
2	4/ 4.5.	(In French) We are primarily concerned with the central area and the increase in employment predicted and are concerned about the demand on transit routes on Wellington, Rideau, Cumberland
BRIEF NO = 119		**Staff:DN**
	(S.A. Cunliffe, City of Nepean)	
1	2/ 3.0.	We support the regional analysis that steers to the middle ground toward the planning horizon of 2006.
2	2/ 4.0.	We support the assumption that demand for single family housing will remain strong as the baby boom generation moves into middle age.
3	2/ 6.0.	We are concerned that only 10 year's supply of serviced land will be available in the mid-90s. This may have a negative effect on price and further cause speculation on rural lands.
3	2/ 8.0.	We support the favoured growth option.
5	2/ 8.1.	...and if detailed study of the stage one lands show that those lands cannot accommodate the estimated demand for 11,300 housing units, the south-of-Jock-River lands should be stage one.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
5	2/ 9.0.	We support the proposal for the next expansion to occur adjacent to Barrhaven north of the Jock River because there is existing infra-structure, it would not put pressure on...
5	2/ 9.0.	...crowded east-west roads, and would not crowd natural features like Mer Bleue in the East or Carp Hills in the West. The Barrhaven agri. lands are not in hands of agricultural interests
5	2/ 8.1.	We feel that a second stage of development should be planned now and that this development should occur south of the Jock River, with the specific boundaries to be determined later.
6	2/10.2.	The proposal to "trigger" development in the south by development east and west cannot be supported. Planning and commitment of infra-structure to the south must begin now.
6	2/10.3.	The allocation of population in the urban communities based on employment performance will negatively affect the communities ability to attract employment. Rather the Region should...
6	2/10.3.	...should take an active role in ensuring required infrastructure is in place and actively support and encourage employment to locate in the urban communities.
9	3/ 3.0.	Objective 7 should be deleted, as compatibility with adjacent uses is a local concern.
9	3/ 4.1.	Despite the general thrust, the designations and specific policies for intensive employment area are too restrictive. The Region confuses the need to encourage them with restricting max size
10	3/ 4.1.	(policy 5) The requirement the community shopping centres locate in int. empl. nodes ignores the preference for large single retail-ers not locate in prime areas (e.g.BellsCorners)
10	3/ 4.1.	(policy 7). Expansions of a non-retail nature at centres along the transitway should not require study.
11	3/ 4.1.	(policy 9) The Region should not be concerned with the size of individual buildings - esp. medical bldgs. - in lieu of a concern about the clustering of bldgs that would hurt transit stas
11	3/ 4.1.	(Policy 8) The requirement for development of at least 1.0 FSI or FAR be subject to adequate transportation facilities being available.
11	3/ 4.1.	(policy 10) The planning of development at transit stations is a local planning responsi-bility. The Region can participate in such studies, but there may be not legal justificat'n
12	3/ 4.2.	(policy 12) The permitted uses are too restric-tive and do not reflect the wide range of uses that are attracted today to 'business parks'.
13	3/ 4.2.	(policy 13) The requirements for walkways and sites for heavy or noxious industry are in-fringements on local responsibilities.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
20	6/ 4.0.	(See our comments on paper 3, sec. 4.1 regarding limitations on shopping centres and office buildings).
21	6/ 4.2.	(See our comments on paper 3, sec. 4.1 regarding requirements for community facilities and walkways). Not all community facilities are appropriately located on public transit routes.
22	6/ 4.3.	High and medium density development sometimes locate near to unique site attributes, not on major roads. Also, Region cannot control location of condo's through approval power.
23	6/ 4.4.	Transit in new communities should be located only on collectors and arterial roads, all of which should have sidewalks.
26	7/ 4.1.	(policy 7) It is inappropriate to enforce 5-yr. housing goals when considering approval of site plans and condo's. Even secondary plans and subdivisions may not be large-scale enough.
30	8/ 3.0.	There are other types of private sewage desiposal systems than 'septic systems'. (objective 2). 'Haphazard' (obj. 4) does not convey the nature of the concern.
31	8/ 3.0.	Are agricultural operations one of the 'adverse environmental influences' that rural residents are to be protected from (obj. 6)?
31	8/ 3.0.	(Obj. 7) "Safe and efficient operation of regional roads" would be better than "minimize disruption of traffic on...". Also add objective to avoid unreasonable supply of approved lots.
32	8/ 4.0.	(Policy 2) Limited infilling adjacent to incompatible land uses should be allowed, subject to appropriate requirements to ameliorate the nuisance.
32	8/ 4.2.	(policies 5iv, 5v) Since many villages are adjacent to natural resource areas, thought should be given to either stopping village growth, establishing new villages, or OKing some res. loss
33	8/ 4.2.	(policy 6) There is no sense to the arbitrary limit of 330 lots for the requirement to study servicing needs. A servicing study should be required for all village proposed for expansion.
35	8/ 4.3.	(policy 9) Smaller lots should be permitted where the units will share open space held in common. Also, it is not clear what is meant by 'net densities'.
36	8/ 4.3.	(policy 13). Rather than an arbitrary 2-km distance around villages, it would be better to require a zone to be designated, within which a study would ne needed before approving lots.
37	8/ 4.4.	Infill development should need to be designated in local official plans. Also, such development should be permitted to 'round off' existing development.
38	8/ 4.4.	Communal systems for mobile home parks should provide for the Region, not the local municipality, to take them over in case of failure.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
38	8/ 5.0.	The allocations system does not encourage develop at desireable locations. Instead, require local pans to designate areas for infilling and country-lot-by-severance and ...
38	8/ 5.0.	...country lot development by subdivision should be permitted by local official plan amendment in relation to the supply of existing vacant lots.
40	9/ 4.3.	We prefer option 1. However local OP policies that recognize special needs of farmers should be permitted. Our current policy has resulted in only 2 farm severances in 8 years.
42	9/ 4.3.	The option 3 attempt to accommodate severances for farm help or farmer's children working on the farm is misplaced. There is no pressure nor justification to create these severences.
46	9/ 4.4.	Non-agricultural uses of poor agricultural pockets should be permitted only by amendment to the local official plan.
48	11/ 5.0.	(Objective 3). Waste management policies should also provide for the rehabilitation of existing sites through adequate provision of funds. The Trail Road landfill site is a prime example.
49	11/ 5.0.	(Policy 8) Region should also have regard to the effects of snow dumps on existing uses, and those policies contained in the local O.P.s and zoning by-laws.
50	11/ 6.0.	(guideline 2) Noise studies should specifically be required before registration of the subdivision in order that recommendations can be incorporated prior to final design and agreement.
51	10/ 4.1.7	The policy is onerous and infexible. It is better, where flood plain mapping exists, to require local O.P.s to identify the flood plain and to require conservation authority approval.
51	11/ 6.0.	(guideline 5) Certain acoustical barriers such as berms and fences, produce an undesireable streetscape or ghetto appearance when introduced in existing areas designed before noise concern.
52	10/ 4.2.	Organic soils should be identified only in local official plans, where information is available, rather than in the Region's OP, based on general studies and small-scale maps.
55	12/ 2.3.	The Region's role in heritage should be one of support to the local level (as such, policies 5, 6 are inappropriate). Also, add policy to allow exceptions in other policies to aid heritage
56	12/ 3.0.	The visual environment policies are oriented more to operations and programs and therefore should not be in the Region's official plan.
58	12/ 4.2.	(Objective 2) It is not necessary that ALL waterfront lands be in public ownership, only that ADEQUATE lands for the public be in public ownership.
59	12/ 4.3.	(Policy 3) The provision of large urban parks cannot be addressing in subdivisions, condos, site planning, etc., but must be done at the initial stages of planning.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
60	12/ 5.2.	The Greenbelt should have only one general designation. Only when a use is proposed that requires services or transportation should the Region review.
62	13/ 5.0.	Baseline Road reconstruction between Greenbank and Richmond Road should be a Tier One priority.

BRIEF NO = 120 **Staff:DN**

(Ray Klassen, Fisher Heights and Area Residents)

1	13/ 5.0.	...trips AND be obligated to pay again for alternative routes. The NCC should not assume that tourists do not want to get around by transit. Their policies will fulfill prophecy.
1	13/ 5.0.	The NCC parkways should not be for the exclusive benefit of tourists; we are the capital for ALL Canadians. Because we use transit, we should not be denied scenic pleasures on every-day...
1	13/ 5.0.	Land for future roadways should be acquired at least 5 years in advance, not on a 'must have' basis. The negotiation over Experimental Farm land for the Cedarview Corridor should be done.
2	13/ 4.5.	Transit stations are not 'user friendly'. They need better lighting and heating. Bell Canada should help provide better phone service at each station.
2	13/ 4.5.	Park-and-ride parking rates should favour the car with several commuters. Also OC Transpo should encourage work-trip shopping by having better shelves and spacing on buses.
3	3/ 4.1.	The boundaries for intensive employment-residential nodes must be clearly drawn and held-to. Ottawa states that they wish to reserve the power to modify them at their pleasure.
3	3/ 4.1.	Considering the planned clustering of uses at transit nodes, thought should be given to incorporating central heating plants at these sites, based on shared heating agreements.
3	6/ 4.3.	We support the concept of higher density housing as proposed on transit lines and around nodes at stations.
3	6/ 4.2.	We do not agree that community facilities need to be located on a transit route. There are many core areas that are appropriate but which will never have transit service.
3	13/ 4.5.	We should add a water bus service, a la San Antonio, Texas, to run on the Canal from Dow's Lake-Preston Street to the Westin Hotel. Flat bottom buses would not have a disruptive 'wash'.
3	13/ 4.5.	The Britannia street car right-of-way is a wonderful bonus and should be retained.
4	2/10.1.	We support the South Urban Community development for new unit additions rather than inner city intensification. Costs for services would come from lot levies without piecemeal disruptions.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
4	6/ 4.4.	We are opposed to the new design trend to have houses back onto major internal streets. This hurts pedestrians and bicyclists by denying human scale. Better to have small berms and ...
4	6/ 4.4.	...and trees, and deeper set-backs for the houses would be better. Surely a journey thru a residential neighbourhood should have elements of pleasure and anticipation, not forebidding.
5	6/ 4.4.	The Region should be involved in local level matter when the area being developed falls into two adjacent municipalities. 'Creative' bylaw was used to create lot of sufficient size.
5	11/ 5.2.	Waste disposal policies should include mandatory recycling of certain materials (see Kitchener-Waterloo survey and ensuing Laidlaw Blue Box System). All leaves in autumn should be recyc'd
5	14/ 3.0.	With so many levels and units of government in area, we support a stronger regional role, esp. in matters dealt with by the federal government: heritage sites, shorelines, tourism, etc.
5	14/ 3.0.	The plan should include policies for disaster control, considering recent events here and abroad. A first point of contact should be made common knowledge.

BRIEF NO = 121 **Staff:DN**

(Charles Walker, Eastont Integrated Services Incorporated)

1	13/ 4.0.	There have been a number of technological advances that make subways more feasible: 1) computer controls for subway control, 2) robotic tunnelling, 3) electric power will replace...
1	13/ 4.0.	...non-renewable oils products, 4) costs of development of the system would be very quickly covered by user fees, but would still require cost participation by 3 levels of gov't & NCC.
1	13/ 4.0.	The congestion along the Queensway costs much: accidents, drivers' nerves, police surveillance, etc. A subway system, however costly, may not be so expensive in comparison.

BRIEF NO = 122 **Staff:DN**

(Fred Meldrum, City of Gloucester)

1	2/10.1.	... three areas proposed for future development. (they own 948 and 2,386 acres in the Gloucester west area). The priorities are 'preferences' and we want all three areas developed anyway.
1	2/10.1.	(addendum to previous brief) We have reviewed our previous brief in light of concerns raised by officials with Urbandale and Campeau corporations, regarding the relative priority of the...
3	2/10.1.	The hesitancy of the Region to designate additional lands in advance of need is not justified 1) the full 20-year time-frame must be addressed 2) there must be sufficient land, 3) land...
3	2/10.1.	...should be designated early in the process, and 4) incrementalism creates uncertainty and unnecessary competition.

PAGE#	REFERENCE	SUMMARY
4	2/10.1.	Our recent research indicates that 1) Notre-Dames-des-Champs can accommodate 10,000 pop., 2) Bank Street area will accommodate 25,000+ pop and 3) Airport West, 25,000 - 35,000 pop.
4	2/10.1.	Therefore all three areas should be shown in the Regional Official Plan; that Leitrim be upgraded to an urban development of 30,000; that development procede as services are available.

BRIEF NO = 123 **Staff:DN**

(Janet Bradley, Solway, Wright)

1	1/10.1.	Our client's (Del Corporation) lands - 235 acres south of old Hwy 15 near Goulbourn-Kanata boundary - should be designated 'residential district' in the plan. (More information later).